

mankind wherever opportunity affords. We will do no injustice to ourselves in doing so; but in executing this agreement we have made with civilization to give freedom to the Philippines we will again invite a new confidence and inspire a new faith on the part of those nations to the south to whom we are offering further hope that their association with us will be profitable and will be with justice and profit to them and with no injustice to ourselves.

I feel that the bill should pass, with such amendments as no doubt will be considered later; and I recommend it to its passage, feeling that while, as one of the able Senators has well said, we may not live to see all the blessings that will arise from the example we are setting, and we will not see all the benefits enjoyed, we will, at least, have the consciousness that the great Greek had when he wrote upon the gates of Sparta, as he bade it good-by, the famous admonition:

I am but a mortal, and, like my fathers, must die; but liberty and justice by our words and deeds may live for our children and our country forever.

I thank the Senate for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if I can get the attention of the Senator from Missouri, I anticipate that he is about to make a motion that the Senate go into executive session. Is that correct?

Mr. STONE. It is.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment at this point. I do not intend to discuss it this evening, but I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, and I should like to offer it now, so that it may be read and printed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I was going to ask the Senator if he would not have it read and printed, so that we may consider it to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I rose to do. I send it to the desk, and I will ask that the Secretary read it, and then that it be printed. I offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Nebraska proposes to insert the following:

Within two years after the passage of this act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of not less than five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement. Within one year after the taking effect of such treaty or agreement the President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to proceed further with the bill tonight?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. STONE. Then I ask that the bill be laid aside.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask unanimous consent that the Philippine bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is ordered.

#### SALE OF FUR-SEAL SKINS.

Mr. STONE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back favorably the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell skins taken from fur seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes, and I submit a report (No. 56) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida (Mr. FLETCHER) to the joint resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the joint resolution be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to sell all skins taken from seals killed on the Pribilof Islands for food purposes under section 11 of the act of August 24, 1912, in such market at such times and in such manner as he may deem most advantageous, and the proceeds of such sale or sales shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 20, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 19, 1916.*

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### IOWA.

W. D. Jamieson, Shenandoah.  
J. B. Lower, Scranton.  
George P. Martin, Peterson.  
William H. Moore, Shelby.

###### MISSOURI.

Zachariah T. Casebolt, Miami.  
James J. Davis, jr., St. Marys.  
William B. Ellis, Elsberry.  
Bristol French, Piedmont.  
Almae C. Hall, Blue Springs.  
James E. Harris, Conway.  
Ernest M. Moore, Corder.  
L. R. McNatt, Purdy.  
William T. Murphy, Parma.  
William L. Peoples, Shelbyville.

###### NEW YORK.

August P. Bolender, Collins.

###### NORTH DAKOTA.

George L. Barrett, Lakota.

###### PENNSYLVANIA.

William H. Cooper, Oakmont.  
William F. Elgin, Glen Olden.  
C. L. Gibbs, Titusville.  
William K. Reed, Eddystone.

###### SOUTH CAROLINA.

Richard T. King, jr., Georgetown.  
Albert C. Ligon, Orangeburg.  
M. J. Spears, Lamar.

###### WASHINGTON.

Eugene J. Edson, Coulee City.  
J. T. Harris, Ridgefield.  
U. Kirby Lail, Sunnyside.  
Thomas McIntyre, Burlington.  
Cleora Steele, Hartline.

###### WEST VIRGINIA.

John L. Evans, Summersville.  
Thomas W. Gocke, Piedmont.  
Walter E. Reeves, Bethany.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 19, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude and praise to Thee, O God our heavenly Father, for all the pure, noble, God-like qualities of mind and soul with which Thou hast endowed Thy children, and we most earnestly pray that amid the untoward circumstances of life, the perplexing problems which confront us, and the temptations which assail us we may be able to make dominant in our lives those qualities and develop a character like unto that of the world's great Exemplar, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGES OF REFERENCES—HARBOR COMMISSIONERS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?  
Mr. OGLESBY. To make a privileged request. I ask that reference of the bill H. R. 3042 be changed from the Union Calendar to House Calendar nunc pro tunc.

The SPEAKER. What is it about?

Mr. OGLESBY. It is a bill which confers certain jurisdiction on the harbor commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii. It does not provide for the raising of any money or the spending of any money.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE AT SAN BERNARDINO, CAL.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CLARK of Florida, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 521, providing for a post office and other purposes at San Bernardino, Cal., and the same was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MEXICO.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent for five minutes that I may read a letter I have.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, following the newspaper accounts of the horrible outrages across the Mexican border, I telegraphed a personal and old-time friend of mine residing on the border for first-hand information. I have received a reply from him. I first received a reply by wire saying he could not answer me by wire, but would write. I think the nature of the letter is such that it can well be heard from this floor. I will first read my telegram to this gentleman and his reply. They are as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1916.

Mr. ————: Much interest here in Mexican situation. Will you wire me, collect, full particulars of feeling among the people, and consensus of opinion what action our Government should take.

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Can not wire answer your inquiry satisfactory because local conditions. Now is time to take a firm, uncompromising stand and to meet our responsibilities without further hesitation; otherwise conditions will grow worse and difficulties increase. Have written.

Yesterday I received his letter and it is as follows:

January 14, 1916.

Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: Your message received to-day inquiring as to Mexican situation and attitude of Americans thereto. I attempted to answer by wire, but found that I really could tell you little without running risk of doing American interests in Mexico possible harm. The telegraph office has leaks, and being in a prominent position here my wire would probably quickly find its way into the hands of the Mexican consul to the detriment of our people to the south of us.

The recent outrages and murders of Americans in Chihuahua has deeply stirred the people of the border States. Some of the murdered men are from this section and are well known locally. The return of their mutilated bodies will add fuel to the flame that has been smoldering for the past five years. While I do not look for trouble the situation has some danger of a race trouble. Approximately 1,000 Mexicans are employed here; trouble here would mean retaliation by Mexicans against Americans employed in Mexico, so that not only Carranza but Villa adherents would have their hand raised against the American. The intense feeling in El Paso has not shown itself here as yet.

We of the border have had five years of uncertainty and humiliation; all Mexican properties running intermittently and railroads destroyed; bullets have been fired into our town without hesitation; citizens have been shot, some fatally; over 100 3-inch shrapnel shells burst on our properties a few weeks ago and plant was compelled to shut down for two days. When Villa last appeared, in November, citizens were urged to leave their homes by the military because Villa said he was going to bombard ———. Americans in their own country forced to abandon their homes and to give up their occupations because of the failure of their Government to protect them.

The people of this section feel that there is nothing to protect them not only south of here but to the north. With 7,000 United States troops here, Mexican bullets came over by the hundreds. I was favored with two in my own house.

This is all preliminary to show that the present state of mind of our border citizens is the outgrowth of an accumulated and just grievance and a deeply seated sense of disappointment and shame that we must submit to such indignities at the hands of half-civilized neighbors.

During the recent raid of ——— by Villa the women of entire villages were given over to the so-called soldiers, and such a case happened at ———, about ——— miles from here. Daughters of respectable families were taken from their homes and passed from soldier to soldier, and yet we wait—for what? For just such occurrences as happened in Chihuahua, the murder of 19 fine chaps, whose deaths are but the harvest of our country's failure to meet its responsibilities. This responsibility rests upon us; we may duck and dodge and find plausible excuses, but we have the work to do. If we fail to assume the obligation, we are to be pitied, for no such Nation can last long.

This continued lack of decision and action has led the Mexican to believe that we are afraid of him. During these five years of turmoil he has been supplied with guns and ammunition through our ports, and he has learned how to use them. Carranza is not generally believed to have the ability to put his government over. Villa's game is, of course, to bring an intervention, and the quickest way to do this is to

murder Americans. Each day of watchful waiting gives rise to much more to watch and witness.

To my mind the only thing to do is to demand and see to it that Carranza exterminates these outlaws within a stipulated and short period. This demand will be treated lightly because of soft impeachment of the past, but if definite results and tangible evidence of a successful government are not at hand within 30 days we should take a firm, uncompromising grip on the situation and put it over. I am not for intervention if a decent government could be put on its feet without armed interference, but I do not believe it can be done.

I appreciate that there are considerations I know nothing of, but I believe these considerations are magnified in an effort to justify our miserable, ineffectual, and characterless policy. Oh, for a strong, virile Americanism that stands for something. We of the border hang our heads.

Yours,

Mr. Speaker, this letter is first-hand information in relation to the conditions as they exist on the border, and I think is worthy of the attention and consideration of this House.

FRANCHISES IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

When the Committee on the Territories was called,

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 65 for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 65) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii entitled "An act relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto," approved by the governor of the Territory April 29, 1913, be, and is hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows:

"ACT 135.

"An act relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto.

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The franchises granted by act 30 of the laws of 1903 of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved April 21, 1904; act 48 of the laws of 1903 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved April 21, 1904; act 66 of the laws of 1905 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved June 20, 1906; act 105 of the laws of 1907 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909; act 130 of the laws of 1907 of said Territory, as amended and approved by said act of Congress approved February 6, 1909; act 115 of the laws of 1909 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved June 25, 1910; and act 66 of the laws of 1911 of said Territory, as amended and approved by an act of Congress approved August 1, 1912, and the persons and corporations holding said franchises shall be subject as to reasonableness of rates, prices, and charges and in all other respects to the provisions of act 89 of the laws of 1913 of said Territory creating a public-utilities commission and all amendments thereof for the regulation of public utilities in said Territory; and all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public works or the courts by said acts granting said franchises are hereby conferred upon and required of said public-utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory; and said acts granting said franchises are hereby amended to conform herewith.

"Sec. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Congress of the United States.

"Approved this 29th day of April, A. D. 1913.

"WALTER F. FREAR,  
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Also the following committee amendments were read:

Page 3, line 4, after the word "ten," strike out the comma and the word "and" and insert a semicolon.

Amend, on page 3, by inserting, after the word "twelve," in line 7, the following:

"And also franchises heretofore granted to any other public utility or public-utility company, and all public utilities and public-utilities companies organized or operating within the Territory of Hawaii."

Amend, on page 3, by inserting, after the word "herewith," in line 24, the following:

"Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall in any wise limit the jurisdiction of powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the acts of Congress to regulate commerce within the States and Territories of the United States: And provided further, That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the said Territory."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is for the purpose of ratifying an act for the Territory of Hawaii. In 1913 the Legislature of Hawaii passed a law creating a public-utilities commission with the intention of placing under the supervision and control of that public-utilities commission all of the public-service corporations in Hawaii. Now, it is a fact that a number of public-service companies or corporations had franchises and rights that were granted by Congress. It was not in the power of this Legislature of Hawaii to put them under this public-utility commission. The object of this act and its approval by Congress is for the purpose of putting all public-service corporations under the control and jurisdiction of this act. That is the general purpose of the bill, and the reason for it is apparent



without argument. It is an effort to put them on the same footing and to give this public-utility commission the same power over all these public-service corporations that it has over those it had the jurisdiction to embrace within it by its own act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Will this have any retroactive effect on vested rights?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think not, sir. That matter has been considered very carefully, and all these companies that have rights and franchises by the Legislature of Hawaii, or by act of Congress, have the provision attached to acts that Congress shall have the power to alter, amend, or change them at any time.

We have had upon that subject and upon all others full hearings before the committee, and the gentleman can get the facts about that from them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of the bill is, "hereby ratified and confirmed." Should we not take some notice of the fact that it is amended? Would it not be better to insert the word "amended" before the word "ratified," so that it would read, "is hereby amended, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows"?

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman means the title of the act of the legislature?

Mr. MANN. Yes; at the top of page 2, where you provide that the act of the legislature is "hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed." I think you should add a word, and state it is "hereby amended, ratified," and so forth. It would cover the case. Something like that ought to go in to show that it is amended.

Mr. HOUSTON. Perhaps the proper amendment would be, "with an amendment."

Mr. MANN. Perhaps so. Perhaps it ought to be, "with an amendment." But it would be sufficient to say, "it is hereby amended, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows."

Mr. HOUSTON. I think that would be sufficient; and, Mr. Speaker, I offer that amendment. After the word "hereby" to insert the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "hereby," insert "amended" and a comma.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOUSTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the committee if the amendment reported by the committee since the reporting of the bill has been submitted or offered?

Mr. HOUSTON. It has not been. I thought it would be right and proper to offer it later on. However, I can offer it now.

Mr. DOWELL. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HOUSTON. All right.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee to offer the amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, after the bill was reported the committee in consultation decided to offer another amendment. It is on page 3 of the reported bill, line 19. The words "or the courts" should be stricken out.

Mr. MANN. The committee amendments have not yet been disposed of?

Mr. HOUSTON. No; I thought it would be proper to bring this up before the other committee amendments were acted upon. I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that I called attention to this amendment for the purpose of discussion, and he can say what he desires about it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak on the amendment partially, and I would like to have it read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 19, strike out the words "or the courts."

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the chairman of the committee, this bill has for its purpose and object the placing of all the public utilities of the Territory of

Hawaii under a utilities commission which was created by the Territory in 1913. This bill was adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii in 1915 and submitted to the Congress for its approval.

Under the provisions of the special acts creating the different utilities in this Territory we find that a great many methods have been adopted by Congress relative to the fixing of rates and to the control of these utilities. The commission is authorized under the provisions of the Territorial law to place all of these public utilities under its supervision and control. While this commission has not all of the authority or power that I would like it to have, it has the power of investigation, it has the power to fix rates and charges, and it has the power to compel service of these corporations. On its own motion it may make an investigation and may examine all the books and contracts of the companies, and may fix such rates as the investigation may show to be just and fair to the consumers or users.

This commission consists of three members, appointed by the governor for a term of three years; and it occurs to me that in order that this commission may have the power to give the best service to the people of the Territory all of these public utilities should be placed under its control and supervision, and all should be treated alike.

Now, on the question of the amendments of the committee, the first amendment is found on page 3 and covers any other public utilities not specified in the original act which may be doing business in the Territory. That your committee believed to be necessary in order that some utility company doing business in the Territory, though not having been granted a charter by Congress, should be placed under this commission.

The second amendment, or the last amendment, provides "That nothing herein contained shall in any wise limit the jurisdiction or powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the acts of Congress to regulate commerce within the States and the Territories of the United States." That amendment was offered by your committee because there is a railroad in this Territory which rightly comes under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and it is not the purpose to in any manner interfere with the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The other provision following is "That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the Territory." This, we believe, should be adopted, because the power of the courts to review the action of the commission in fixing rates and charges, after making this investigation, should be retained by the courts.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that the last proviso is that all acts of the public utilities commission shall be subject to review. It has power, has it not, besides the power to fix rates?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think that all acts of a commission like that ought to be subject to the courts?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Purely administrative acts?

Mr. DOWELL. Congress has heretofore placed all of this power within the hands of a superintendent of public works, and no power is given to this commission, except what was in the power conferred by Congress upon the superintendent of public works.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But does the gentleman think that all of the acts, those acts that are purely administrative, not touching rates and not affecting the finances of the company at all, should be subject to court review?

Mr. DOWELL. I suppose the only question that could be raised would be the question of the reasonableness of the order of the commission.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman mean that this bill will give the court the right to fix rates in the future that would be purely legislative?

Mr. DOWELL. No. It is only the right to review the action of the commission in making an order.

Mr. SIMS. Whether it had exceeded its authority?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; whether it was arbitrary or reasonable; and that power, it seems to me, ought always to be lodged with the courts.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. Is any power given to the courts in Hawaii that is not ordinarily given to the courts in the different States of the Union, over the acts and doings and decisions of public utilities commissions?

Mr. DOWELL. I think the act creating the public utility commission provided for an appeal directly to the supreme court, and all of the actions of that commission are by the act itself subject to review by the supreme court of the Territory.

Now I come to the next question, which is the amendment just offered by the chairman of the committee, and which is to strike out of line 19 the words "or the courts." I want to call attention to this amendment, gentlemen, because it is a question which involves the authority and the power of this commission, and also, it affects the power and authority of the courts heretofore granted in the various charters of these public utilities. Under the special charters that have heretofore been granted by the Congress we find that the methods of arriving at the rates and charges have not been uniform.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to read, beginning at line 17, page 3, of the bill, the language which this amendment seeks to change, so that you may thoroughly understand the purpose of the amendment. In line 17, page 3, after the semicolon, I read:

And all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public works or the courts by said acts granting said franchises are hereby conferred upon and required of said public-utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory.

This amendment strikes out the words "or the courts"; and by striking out these words this amendment leaves conferred upon the utilities commission all of the powers and duties of the superintendent of public works, and does not confer upon the utilities commission the power and authority heretofore granted, in each special charter granted by Congress, to the courts of the Territory. I heartily favor this amendment, because I am not ready to take from the courts of the Territory the power and authority vested in the courts by the adoption of these special charters, which includes the power of condemnation of property, and also to forfeit the charters of these public utilities. This is a special power conferred upon the courts of the Territory by the acts creating these charters, and I believe the Congress is not ready to take from the courts the power and authority that have been heretofore granted in this respect. For this reason I hope that the amendment will be adopted; and with this amendment adopted, I believe that this bill is in the right direction, and that we are giving to the people of the Territory a better system and a better opportunity of fixing the rates and control of these public utilities than they have heretofore had. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I have just come in, and I do not know what may have been said. I want to ask the gentleman a question in reference to the last proviso in section 1:

That all acts of the public-utility commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the said Territory.

I should like to ask the gentleman in what way that amends or changes the utility law passed by the Territory?

Mr. HOUSTON. It does not change it at all. That is already the law of the Territory, as I understand it, and that clause was inserted in order that this act should not exempt these public-service corporations from the same control that the courts now have.

Mr. LENROOT. Not every act of a utility commission is reviewable by the courts of the States, so far as reasonableness is concerned. Will not the language contained in this bill deprive this utility commission of all power of determining the question of reasonableness and place the original matter in the courts in every instance where the act is complained of?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not think so. Under the law of the Territory now the courts have jurisdiction and the right of review, and in the operation of this law in regard to these public-service corporations no question of that kind has been considered by the courts. They have left the question of fixing rates, and their reasonableness, to the superintendent of public works heretofore, and the proper authorities have had control of that. But this general provision is to cover a case

that might arise, and if an injury or an injustice should be done by an act of theirs of that kind, under this law they would have the right to appeal to the supreme court of the Territory.

Mr. LENROOT. The language with reference to the review is very much broader than the language giving to the courts of the United States the power of reviewing the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and is very much broader than the authority given to the courts in reviewing decisions of State utilities commissions, so far as I know.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To interrogate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman from Tennessee explain whether there is any organic law authorizing Congress to amend an act of the Hawaiian Legislature?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; every act. There is no provision in the organic law empowering Congress to do that specifically, but in all these public-service company charters there is a provision reserving to Congress the right to alter, amend, or repeal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then these changes proposed now by the Congress of the United States are in line with the authority heretofore conferred?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; exactly; and these are the changes that have been passed by the legislature. It is the act of the Territory which is being ratified here.

Unless some one else wishes to speak, I ask the Clerk to read the bill.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk has read the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I have just a moment to answer the question which has been asked?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. In the provision of the law of the Territory, section 2234, all of the latitude proposed in the committee amendment is given in the original act creating the utilities commission. Your committee have conferred no greater or different power than is reserved by the charter in creating this commission.

The SPEAKER. Unless some gentleman wants to speak on this, the Chair will put the question. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MANN. There was an amendment offered which has not been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the last amendment reported by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 19, strike out the words "or the courts."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the committee amendments? If not, they will be put in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER FRANCHISE IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS OF HAWAII.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6241) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the public utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder," is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed, and section 857 of chapter 59 of the revised laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby amended by adding after the words "district of Wailuku" wherever appearing in said section 857 the following words: "And district of Makawao," so that the same shall read as follows:



"Sec. 857. Franchise: H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, together with their associates, hereafter called 'The Company,' and their respective successors and assigns, are vested with the right, authority, and privileges, from and after February 6, 1909, to manufacture, sell, furnish, and supply electric light, electric current, or electric power in the district of Walluku and district of Makawao, on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, for lighting the streets, roads, public or private buildings, or for motive power, or for any other purpose which they may deem advisable, and from time to time for the purposes above mentioned, and subject to the approval and supervision of the boards or officials having charge of said streets or roads to construct, maintain, and operate suitable poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lamp posts, conductors, conduits, and such other appliances and appurtenances as may from time to time be necessary for the transmission, distribution, or supply of electricity to consumers thereof, under, along, upon, and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said district of Walluku and district of Makawao, on the island of Maui, and to connect the said lines, wires, and conductors with any manufactory, private or public buildings, lamps, lamp posts, or other structure or object with the place of supply."

Sec. 2. Section 859 of said chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby amended by striking out the word "district" in said section 859 and substituting therefor the word "districts," so that the same shall read as follows:

"Sec. 859. Poles, etc., not to interfere with use of streets, etc.: All poles, lines, wires, cables, lamps, lamp posts, conductors, conduits, and other appliances constructed, maintained, or operated under, along, upon, and over the streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes in said districts, on the island of Maui, shall be so constructed, maintained, and operated by the company as to not unnecessarily interfere with the use of such streets, sidewalks, roads, squares, bridges, alleys, and lanes by the public."

Sec. 3. Said chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, as approved by an act of Congress approved February 6, 1909, is hereby further amended by adding a new section thereto, to be known as section 865A, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, and reading as follows:

"Sec. 865A. This franchise and the person or corporation holding the same shall be subject as to reasonableness of rates, prices, and charges, and in all other respects to the provisions of chapter 128 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, creating a public utilities commission, and all amendments thereof for the regulation of the public utilities in said Territory, and all the powers and duties expressly conferred upon or required of the superintendent of public work or the courts by said act creating said franchise, are hereby conferred upon and required of said public utilities commission and any commission of similar character that may hereafter be created by the laws of said Territory."

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Congress of the United States, provided that such approval be given on or before the 4th day of March, 1917.

During the reading of the bill the following occurred:

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina makes the point that no quorum is present, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-seven Members present—not a quorum.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EMERSON) there were 149 ayes and 3 noes.

So the motion for a call of the House was agreed to. The Doorkeeper was ordered to close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms to notify Members.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Farr	Jones	Patten
Austin	Finley	Keister	Pou
Black	Flynn	Kent	Price
Booher	Gallagher	Kitchin	Rowland
Callaway	Gallivan	Kreider	Sabath
Campbell	Glass	Leibel	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	Loft	Scully
Clark, Fla.	Graham	Longworth	Sparkman
Conry	Gray, Ala.	McGillcuddy	Stout
Crago	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Summers
Cullop	Gregg	McLemore	Tague
Dale, N. Y.	Griffin	Maher	Talbot
Dempsey	Guernsey	Miller, Pa.	Winslow
Dyer	Hamill	Moss, Ind.	Wise
Edmonds	Helm	Overmyer	
Estophinal	Helvering	Paige, Mass.	
Fairchild	Hinds	Parker, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this call 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to. The doors were opened.

The Clerk proceeded with and completed the reading of the bill.

The following committee amendment was read:

On page 5, at the end of section 3, add the following: "Provided, That all acts of the public utilities commission herein provided for shall be subject to review by the courts of the Territory of Hawaii."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is an act to ratify and approve an act amending this franchise in the Territory of Hawaii, and I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, the only object of this bill is to extend the right of this franchise from the district of Walluku into the district of Makawao, a district adjoining.

The original charter was granted to H. P. Baldwin and others in 1909 for the first district named. It was at that time understood that Baldwin & Co. were to have the benefit of the electric power of the Baldwin Sugar Co., but the Baldwins transferred the right to the electric company, and in this transfer this reservation of power, which had been contemplated would be used by the company, was not secured, and it threw a very onerous burden on the company and made the conditions such that they were unable to proceed with the operation of the work within that limited territory. Being thus embarrassed and hampered on account of the limited territory, they thought proper to ask the legislature of the Hawaiian Islands to grant them the right to extend the franchise to the district of Makawao, and the charter was so extended. A grant was given to the electric company, and this simply is to ratify the act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. There are no complications, nothing except the extension of that right. It does transfer all of the rights to the public utility commission which has recently been created there to take charge of all public utilities.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that a certain act of the Territorial legislature, naming the act by title, "is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed," and then goes on to provide that section 857 of chapter 59 of the revised laws, and so forth, is amended to read "as follows," and then in other sections of the bill provides that other sections of the Territorial law be amended to read "as follows," and so forth. Is it supposed that the Territorial act, which is ratified and approved, is set out in the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is not what the bill says.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what the original act says, and that is copied in the bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman is satisfied with it, I am not going to complain; but it sets out the title of the Territorial act and says that it is ratified, approved, and so forth, and then goes on and says "and section 587 of chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii \* \* \* is hereby amended," and so forth.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what is reenacted in this bill—the section the gentleman now refers to.

Mr. MANN. The bill differentiates between the act of the legislature which is approved and the section which is amended.

Mr. WATKINS. This charter is simply granted under the statute law of the Territory.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, if I may have his attention, that I have before me the statute referred to there. Chapter 59 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii is the charter granted to H. P. Baldwin and others. First, there is the franchise; second, the operation, subject to regulations, which is 858; then 859 provides how they must set their poles, and 860 provides for inspection of plants, 861 for being responsible for negligence, and 862 for forfeiture of franchise, and so forth. This bill simply ratifies all of that, but extends it to additional territory, gives them a little more territory to operate in.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking about the form of the bill, which plainly says that a certain act, which it names, is ratified, approved, and confirmed, and as an additional proposition that section 857 is amended by adding certain words, and in section 2 it provides that section 859 is amended by adding certain words, and chapter 59 is further amended by adding a new section. There is nothing in the bill to indicate that you ratify and approve an act and afterwards amend certain other sections. It is all supposed to relate to the same matter. The form of the bill will leave it in dispute as to what is meant.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, while there is no particular objection to having the suggestion of the gentleman incorporated by way of amendment, the only idea is that all the law on that subject matter would remain intact except as amended, and as amended the amendment is stated in the bill. There can not be any doubt about it. There is no reason particularly for inserting the amendment. It will not add to or subtract from the bill. I think it is sufficient, but if there is an amendment offered to that effect we will not object to it.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, if no one else desires to speak, I will ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF HAWAII.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the bill H. R. 3042, to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, and amending the laws relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That sections 1, 2, and 3 of act 169 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, 1915, entitled "An act to amend chapter 49 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, relating to harbors, by amending sections 683, 685, 687, and 691, and by adding one new section thereto to be known as section 691 A," approved by the governor of the Territory April 26, 1915, be, and the same are hereby, ratified, approved, and confirmed, as follows:

"SECTION 1. Section 683 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 683. Board of harbor commissioners: Except as otherwise provided by law, all ocean shores below mean high-water mark, shore waters, and navigable streams, and all harbors and roadsteads, and all harbor and water-front improvements, belonging to or controlled by the Territory of Hawaii, and all shipping within such harbors, roadsteads, waters, and streams shall be under the care and control of a board of harbor commissioners. Said board shall consist of five members, one of whom shall be the superintendent of public works of the Territory who shall be chairman, ex officio, and four shall be appointed by the governor as provided in section 80 of the organic act. Such commissioners shall be appointed for terms of four years or the unexpired periods thereof, in such manner that the terms of two commissioners shall expire every second year. Said terms shall begin on the 1st day of July: *Provided, however,* That upon the first appointments two of said commissioners shall be appointed for terms ending June 30, 1913, and two for terms ending June 30, 1915."

"SEC. 2. Section 685 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 685. Powers and duties of board: Except as otherwise provided by law, said board shall have and exercise all the powers and shall perform all the duties which may lawfully be exercised by or under the Territory of Hawaii relative to the control and management of the shores, shore waters, navigable streams, harbors, harbor and water-front improvements, ports, docks, wharves, quays, bulkheads, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, and the shipping using the same, and shall have the authority to use and permit and regulate the use of the wharves, piers, bulkheads, quays, and landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory for receiving or discharging passengers and for loading and landing merchandise, with a right to collect wharfage and demurrage thereon or therefor, and, subject to all applicable provisions of law, to fix and regulate from time to time rates for services rendered in mooring vessels, charges for the use of moorings belonging to or controlled by the Territory, rates or charges for the services of pilots, wharfage or demurrage, rents or charges for warehouses or warehouse space, for office or office space, for storage of freight, goods, wares, and merchandise, for storage space, for the use of donkey engines, derricks, or other equipment belonging to the Territory, under the control of the board, and to make other charges except toll or tonnage charges on freight passing over or across wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, or landings. The board shall likewise have power to appoint and remove clerks, wharfingers and their assistants, pilots and pilot-boat crews, and all such other employees as may be necessary, and to fix their compensation; to make rules and regulations pursuant to this chapter and not inconsistent with law; and generally shall have all powers necessary fully to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

"All moneys appropriated for harbor improvements, including new construction, reconstruction, repairs, salaries, and operating expenses, shall be expended under the supervision and control of the board, subject to the provisions of this chapter and of chapter 100. All contracts and agreements authorized by law to be entered into by the board shall be executed on its behalf by its chairman.

"The board shall prepare and submit annually to the governor a report of its official acts during the preceding calendar year, together with its recommendations as to harbor improvements throughout the Territory."

"SEC. 3. Section 687 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 687. Rules and regulations: The board may from time to time make, alter, amend, and repeal such rules and regulations not inconsistent with law as it may deem necessary respecting the manner in which all vessels may enter and moor, anchor, or dock in the shore waters, navigable streams, harbors, ports, and roadsteads of the Territory, or move from one dock, wharf, bulkhead, quay, landing, anchorage, or moorings to another within such waters, streams, harbors, ports, or roadsteads; the examination, guidance, and control of pilots and harbor masters and their assistants, and their conduct while on duty; the embarking or disembarking of passengers; the expeditions and careful handling of freight, goods, wares, and merchandise of every kind which may be delivered for shipment or discharged on the wharves, docks, quays, bulkheads, or landings belonging to or controlled by the Territory; and defining the duties and powers of carriers, shippers, and consignees respecting passengers, freight, goods, wares, and merchandise in and upon such wharf, landing, dock, quay, or bulkhead. The board may also make further rules and regulations for the safety of the docks, wharves, landings, quays, bulkheads, and harbor and water-front improvements belonging to or controlled by the Territory.

"Said board may also, from time to time, make, alter, amend, and repeal such rules not inconsistent with law as shall be deemed necessary for the proper regulation and control of all shipping in the harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams belonging to or controlled by the Territory, and of the entry, departure, mooring, and berthing of vessels therein, and for the regulation and control of all other matters and things connected with shipping in all such harbors, shore waters,

and navigable streams; and rules and regulations to prevent the throwing into such harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams of rubbish, refuse, garbage, or other substances liable to make such harbors, shore waters, and navigable streams unsightly, unhealthful, or unclean, or liable to fill up or shoal or shallow such harbors, shore waters, and streams, and likewise to prevent the escape of fuel or other oils into such harbors, shore waters, and streams, either from any vessel or from pipes or storage tanks upon the land.

"Any rules and regulations so made shall be published by said board in the manner prescribed for the promulgation of the laws of the Territory, and upon such publication shall have the force and effect of law."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "confirmed" insert the words "with an amendment."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "except as otherwise provided by law, all" and insert the word "all."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that committee amendment and instead thereof amend line 3, page 2, by inserting after the word "hereby" the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendment and substitute one which the Clerk will report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "hereby" insert the word "amended."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "except as otherwise provided by law, said" and insert the word "Said."

Page 6, insert as a new section the following:

"SEC. 4. The jurisdiction and powers hereby conferred on the board of harbor commissioners are subject to such restrictions as may be imposed by the statutes of the Territory of Hawaii, and shall be exercised in accordance with the provisions thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the remaining committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows:

A bill to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is that all that the gentleman's committee has?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report a bill to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes. (H. Rept. 57.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I intend to call up the bill to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York gives notice he is going to call up the bill to-morrow? What time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Right after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. Just after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk will continue the call of committee.

#### BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

When the Committee on Labor was called,

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 153, known as the bill to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.



The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.  
The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 153) to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a bureau of labor safety. There shall be a commissioner of labor safety, who shall be the head of said bureau, to be appointed by the President, and who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum. There shall also be in the said bureau a chief clerk and such experts, special agents, clerks, and other employees as may be authorized from time to time by appropriation or other law. It shall be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to make general and special investigation and examination of labor-safety plans and devices of all kinds and the need therefor, generally and specially, and also the study of devices and methods for the prevention of vocational diseases, and to make public the results of such investigation, examination, and study from time to time. It shall be the duty of the Public Health Service in its investigation of vocational diseases and their causes to cooperate with such bureau upon request of the Secretary of Labor. It shall also be the province and duty of such bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning the use of labor-safety plans and devices and vocational diseases in the industries of the United States and elsewhere.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, very briefly stated, the object of this bill, which received the approval of the House in the last Congress but failed of the necessary attention in the Senate, is to establish in the Department of Labor a function in the nature of a clearing house of information with reference to devices and methods calculated to prevent personal injury and loss of life in industrial occupations.

The ratio of accidents to the number employed in the United States, I regret to say, ranks very much higher than it does in the countries of Europe. It would not be exaggerating the difference to say that the tendency in our industries is to kill and injure at least twice as many for a day's employment as experience shows abroad.

As Members of the House well know, proper attention has at last been given in this country to the subject of these accidents in the direction of making compensation to the victims, at least two-thirds of the States having enacted legislation known as accident-compensation legislation.

It is probably not an exaggerated statement to say, although there is no definite computation, that the accident bill in a financial sense only will mean a loss to the industries of the country of \$150,000,000 a year when these accident-compensation bills have become adopted and applied by all the States.

So, outside of the humane motive of preventing the injury to the victim himself, there is a financial phase of the matter of proportion calling for attention, and the very best attention, on our part. It is to be observed, Mr. Speaker, that in countries where the accident-compensation systems have gone into effect—and I have in mind the British railways particularly—the effect of penalizing the accident by requiring compensation to the victim, without reference to the fact of negligence, has been to cut down and reduce the number of accidents very materially. When the motives of humanity and the financial interests are both joined, it has been found that methods and devices preventive of accident have been called into activity with the splendid results I have suggested in the case of the British railways.

I need not say more—perhaps I was not called upon to say as much—with reference to legislation the commendable character of which appears so obviously on its own face.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the author of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not say very much concerning the bill, because I believe there is no opposition to it. I think there is no service we can render that is more valuable to humanity than to save the life and limb which otherwise would be lost by accident in the ordinary course of enterprise, and the Government can well afford to have experts somewhere in the Government who can give advice and aid to manufacturers in the effort to adopt safety appliances and devices which will prevent accidents causing injury or death.

That is the design of this bill. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] and the

other members of the Committee on Labor, which I regard as one of the most important committees of the House, for giving early attention to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, there has been on the part of some in the department and on the part of some gentlemen outside of the department, who are interested in the working of the department, some little fear that this bill might take away from some of the other official bodies of the Government authority which had been conferred upon them by act of Congress. While I do not think that the bill does that, in order to obviate any question and to dispel that fear, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following proviso, to wit:

"Provided, That nothing in this act shall be held to repeal, modify, or affect any other act of Congress in force at the time of the passage of this act."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEWIS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### CHILD LABOR.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, if now in order, I wish to call up the bill H. R. 8234, known as the Keating child-labor bill, and in that connection I should like to secure the acquiescence of the House, if I may, to an arrangement tentatively entered into by the friends and opponents of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state the arrangement?

Mr. LEWIS. The majority report on the bill has been printed, and is available, but the minority views have not been printed, and yesterday the House gave the minority five calendar days in which to prepare them. I wish to ask the unanimous consent of the House that further consideration of the bill after reading the first section be deferred until Calendar Wednesday next, and that any time lost to-day should be reserved in favor of the bill for a later occasion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title of the bill and first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

To prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That no producer, manufacturer, or dealer shall ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the product of any mine or quarry situated in the United States, which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 16 years, or the product of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment situated in the United States which has been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years or by the labor of children between the ages of 14 and 16 years who work more than eight hours in any one day, or more than six days in any one week, or after the hour of 7 o'clock p. m. or before the hour 7 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] asks unanimous consent that this bill go over until a week from to-day.

Mr. LEWIS. And that the time surrendered to-day, which is about three hours, be reserved for any subsequent Calendar Wednesday for the use of the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is this the last bill that the Committee on Labor is going to call up to-day?

Mr. LEWIS. It is.

The SPEAKER. And that the remainder of this legislative day, say about three hours, although there is nothing fixed about the length of the day, shall be reserved by the Committee on Labor for the consideration of this bill. Has the Chair stated it right?

Mr. LEWIS. On the following Calendar Wednesday. That would be two weeks from to-day.

The SPEAKER. Next Calendar Wednesday is next Wednesday, and not two weeks from to-day.

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Labor would have the balance of to-day and next Calendar Wednesday under the new rule. What they want to do is to give up the balance of to-day and, if necessary, have the three hours on the second Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wanted to understand. The rule provides that the Committee on Labor, for instance, have two Wednesdays hand running if it has business. Now, the gentleman asks that this be postponed until next Calendar Wednesday, and that the remainder of this legislative day, about three hours, shall be granted to that committee two weeks from to-day, provided the committee needs it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Rather, I wish to ask for information. As a matter of fact, if we do not object to this at this time, can the objection be raised on next Wednesday as to the extension of this time?

The SPEAKER. It can not, if the committee agrees to do it by unanimous consent to-day.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I object.

Mr. LEWIS. This is a concession to the gentleman's view of the matter. We are ready to-day to take the affirmative argument on this subject and make our argument to the House on this bill, and the minority make their argument next Wednesday, but at the request of the minority itself the majority argument is to be deferred until next Wednesday.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me, before he interposes his objection?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina withhold a moment?

Mr. RAGSDALE. One moment.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina and to the House that the child-labor bill, which is the next bill that would be reported under the call, was reported from the committee on day before yesterday. The views of the minority of that committee have not been prepared, and on yesterday this House accorded to the minority members the right within five legislative days to present their views. It so happens that Calendar Wednesday comes to-day. The bill has been reported, and the report is before the House, but the views of the minority are not before the House. Gentlemen entertaining the minority views very naturally objected to debate upon the proposition to-day before the issue could be joined and their views presented to the House. Under those circumstances the committee was anxious that it should not lose its place upon the calendar, but at the same time that the discussion should not be precipitated when the record was thus incompletely made up. For that reason I, and gentlemen like-minded with myself, requested the chairman of the committee, in order to preserve his place upon the calendar, to permit the committee to give way to-day and ask unanimous consent that its place on the calendar should be carried over until next Wednesday; and in the meanwhile the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], the chairman of the Committee on Roads, might take up the road bill, which has been reported to the House, so that having gone over until next Wednesday whatever time had been lost to the Labor Committee, by reason of not taking up this question this afternoon, should be accorded to it on next Calendar Wednesday. I think that is a concession on the part of the committee to the views entertained by myself and the views which I understand the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] entertains.

It will be better, in my judgment, that this discussion be postponed until next Wednesday. In fact, I think it would be unjust if it were not postponed. For that reason I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will see that the postponement of this discussion at this time makes for a fairer and better opportunity for gentlemen entertaining his views to present them than could be had if this matter is precipitated at this time; and therefore I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take the liberty of stating to all the Members—some of them are not here—that this Calendar Wednesday rule about debate has been radically changed, and only two hours of general debate are now allowed on one of these bills.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask that the other gentlemen who have bills on the calendar that might be called up whether they would be willing to practically dispense with to-day as Calendar Wednesday and go ahead with the roads bill, so as not to involve matters by having the bills go over. I think they are in very good shape to get their bills up very soon anyhow.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on the Revision of the Laws is the next committee on the calendar, I will state that our committee has no objection to that arrangement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday for the rest of the day?

There was no objection.

#### RURAL POST ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, the rural post-roads bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, known as the rural post-roads bill, with Mr. RUCKER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7617, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill by title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; that for the purposes of this act the term "rural post road" shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in said cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart; that not more than \$25,000,000 shall be appropriated under the provisions of this act for any fiscal year.

SEC. 2. That out of any appropriation made under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall deduct the sum which he shall deem necessary to defray the expenses of his department in the administration of this act and apportion the balance of said appropriation for expenditure under the provisions of this act in the several States in the following manner: \$65,000 to each State and one half of the remainder in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the population of all of the States as shown by the latest available Federal census and the other half of such remainder in the ratio which the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes in such State bears to the mileage of rural free delivery and star mail routes of all the States as shown by the latest available report of the Postmaster General.

SEC. 3. That as soon as may be after the passage of any act making appropriations under the provisions of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare and file in his office a statement showing the amount of such appropriation he has set apart to defray the expense of his department in the administration of this act, and the amount of the balance which will be available for expenditure in each State, and transmit a copy of such statement to the State highway department of each State which has such a department, and to the governor of each State which has not such a department; that the State highway department of any State, after receiving such statement, may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for aid under the provisions of this act in the construction or maintenance of any rural post road in such State; and if, in his judgment, such road is one to the proposed construction or maintenance of which aid should be given under the provisions of this act, then he shall request such State highway department to furnish him with surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost of said proposed construction or maintenance, and any other information which he may consider proper; that he shall examine said surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates of cost and determine what would be the reasonable cost of such construction or maintenance and what amount of aid will be given under the provisions of this act to such proposed construction or maintenance, which shall in no case be less than 30 nor more than 50 per cent of what he has so determined would be the reasonable cost of such proposed construction or maintenance, and shall forthwith transmit to said State highway department a written statement of his said determinations; that upon receipt of such written statement the said State highway department may transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture a statement in writing notifying him that such proposed construction or maintenance will be undertaken upon the terms proposed; that thereupon the proper authorities of the State may, in accordance with the laws of such State, commence and prosecute said construction or maintenance in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications; that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that said construction or maintenance of said road has been finished in substantial compliance with said surveys, plans, and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State whatever remains unpaid of the amount which he has stated, as hereinbefore provided, would be given to aid said State in said proposed construction or maintenance of said road; that the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments upon such construction or maintenance as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance.

SEC. 4. That all construction and maintenance of roads under the provisions of this act shall be under the supervision and control of the State highway departments of the several States: *Provided*, That until January 1, 1920, the amount which has been apportioned to be expended in any State which has no State highway department shall be available for expenditure in such State in such manner as shall be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the governor of such State; that the Secretary of Agriculture may make, or cause to be made, such inspection and examinations of any road constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act as he shall deem necessary, and he may prescribe what reports shall be made to him by the State highway department of any State in relation to any road in such State to the construction or maintenance of which aid under the provisions of this act has been given or sought, when such reports shall be made, and the form and subject matter of the same; that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to employ such assistants, clerks,



and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere to purchase such materials and supplies and to prescribe such rules and regulations for the administration of this act as he may consider expedient.

Sec. 5. That the necessary culverts and bridges shall be considered as parts of the roads constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act; that the roads which may be constructed or maintained under the provisions of this act shall include earth, sand-clay, sand-gravel, and other common types of roads, as well as roads of higher classes, one of the purposes of this act being to encourage and promote the improvement of a general system of roads leading from cities, towns, and railway stations into the adjacent farming communities.

Sec. 6. That all payments of money from appropriations under the provisions of this act shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon warrants drawn by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 7. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

[Mr. SHACKLEFORD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I am in favor of Federal aid for highways. I believe it is correct in principle, and I believe there is an overwhelming sentiment in the United States in favor of Federal aid to roads.

Our road system is wholly inadequate to meet the demands of this twentieth-century civilization. We inherit our road system from England, a system that England discarded in the seventeenth century. The great fault with our present road system is that it places upon the rural population the burden of building and maintaining 2,000,000 miles of roads, and then we criticize the farmer because he does not give us better roads.

We have made more advancement in the good-road movement in the last 10 years than we did in the preceding 50 years. The reason is that many of the various States have created highway commissions and have entered upon a system of State aid. We want that supplemented by national aid.

The advocates for national roads insist upon several things. One of them is that the amount appropriated by the General Government will be equitably distributed and divided among the various States.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. That is one of the very points that the minority of the committee makes, that this money is not equitably divided. Will the gentleman discuss that?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I will discuss that. The second requisite is that the National Government sees that every dollar expended by the National Government goes on the roads and is expended in an economical way, so that the Government gets a dollar's worth of road for every dollar invested.

I believe this bill meets those requirements.

First, in regard to the apportionment of the money appropriated the bill carries an appropriation of \$25,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is it not true that this bill does not carry any appropriation at all?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The \$25,000,000 is named in the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is an authorization.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Just simply an authorization. That is correct. Now, we propose to divide this \$25,000,000 and apportion it as follows:

First, we give each State as a unit \$65,000. Then, after deducting the amount that it costs to administer the law, we take 50 per cent of the balance of the money and divide it among the several States according to the mileage of the star routes and rural routes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman what impelled the committee to reach the conclusion that \$65,000 should be given to each State as an initial amount.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer that in this way: We thought that in the apportionment of this fund we would apportionate it in three ways. I will show the gentleman that it is equitable that States which have not a great population or a great mileage, but want to get good roads and want to improve the roads they have, should have something to start with; so we thought that to give each State the amount of \$65,000 was simply fixing an arbitrary amount that we would give to each State for that purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. What is going to be done with that \$65,000, and what is it given to the States for?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is for roads.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the consideration?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question in arguing in favor of these other apportionments. It

supplements those, and the three apportionments make it so that every State is reasonably provided for.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How is the \$65,000 distributed in the States themselves?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will get to that in a moment. The \$65,000, and all the amounts given to the States, are distributed by the highway commissions of the States, if they have highway commissions, together with the Secretary of Agriculture. I will explain that further on.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman answer my question.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question within the next minute or two. I want simply to speak of these other apportionments.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield until I have made a statement. Then I shall be pleased to do so.

As I said, the first part we divide among the States as units, giving each one \$65,000. Next, we distribute 50 per cent of the remainder among the States, according to the mileage of rural routes and star routes.

The third apportionment is to distribute the balance among the several States, according to their population.

This apportionment I believe is fair. It gives the large State with a medium population a fair show on the road mileage; it gives the small State with small road mileage and a large population a fair apportionment on the basis of population, and it gives States as a unit \$65,000 to equalize the apportionment. It gives the small State that has a sparse population and a rather small mileage something along on that line. So that when you take the three modes of apportionment—figure them out—as you will see in the report, it gives each State in the Union a fair apportionment of the funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Did I understand that each State is to get \$65,000 regardless of whether it has any highway commission or not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Without respect to the road mileage or the population?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Take the case of a State where they have no highway commission and spend no money on roads, and all the money they get is \$65,000. What will they do with it?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The bill provides that where they have no highway commission the governor of the State shall distribute the fund, and they will have to have a highway commission by 1920 or they will get no more money. Twenty years ago only 10 States in the Union had highway commissions, and now they all have highway commissions except 8.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will allow me, the gentleman said that the State must have a highway commission by 1920. Is it the purpose of this bill not to distribute any money until 1920?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Oh, no; but I say until that time, it is to give the States a little time to prepare themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. And in the meantime what happens to the \$65,000?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I have stated that the governor of the State, with the Secretary of Agriculture, will say upon what roads it shall go.

Mr. MADDEN. How many miles of road will \$65,000 build?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The State gets \$65,000, but it also comes in on the road-mileage apportionment and also the apportionment under population, so that they all get considerably more than the \$65,000.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the scientific basis upon which the committee fixed the sum of \$65,000 as necessary for each State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Sixty-five thousand dollars, the amount specified in the bill, is purely an arbitrary amount fixed by the committee, but taken with the other two apportionments, it makes a very fair apportionment of the amount of the fund. I can not conceive any better way of apportioning funds for roads than the number of miles of road as one element; I can not imagine any better apportionment to go with it than the population, the number of people who are going to travel over the roads. But we want to encourage the small State, the State that has not many roads, has a sparse population, and so we give each State a certain amount as a unit. But the three apportionments taken together, according to the best experts we have, make as fair an apportionment as you can have.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is the apportionment that you have just spoken of to be taken as the future purpose for road building?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As an initial appropriation?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman was a member of the Committee on Roads in the last Congress.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. In the bill passed in the last Congress there is no specific appropriation for a flat amount.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; the apportionment was practically the same as in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. There was \$25,000,000 authorized, to be divided into halves, and there were two bases for apportioning the halves.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The apportionment in that bill was practically the same as it is in this. Now, on the apportionment principle, there are a great many ways which could be suggested for this apportionment. Many of them would be probably fair, but I believe that, taking these three ways of apportioning the fund, it makes a very fair apportionment.

The next requirement is that the money which the Federal Government appropriates shall be fairly invested and economically invested, and not wasted. Under this bill, when the highway commission, if it has one, and if not, the governor of the State, brings out a system of roads and presents it to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture looks over the system of roads and determines what roads are to have Federal aid and whether that aid should be 30 per cent or 50 per cent or any per cent between those two amounts. He also specifies where the roads shall go and what kind of roads shall be built. After that is done, if it is accepted by the State highway commission and the State builds the road, after the roads are built, the facts and data are presented to the Secretary of Agriculture. He looks over the figures. He is having roads built in the 48 different States of the Union, and he knows just what kind of roads can be built and how much they cost.

If he thinks the road has been built in an economical way, in substantial compliance with the plans and specifications presented, he says you can have 50 per cent, or the per cent he has agreed upon. If he makes up his mind that they have been extravagant, that the road has cost more than it ought to have cost, then, under this bill he has the right to give that State commission 50 per cent of what that road ought to have cost. So, no matter if you build a road that costs \$5,000 a mile which ought to have only cost \$4,000 a mile you will only get \$2,000.

You do not get what your road cost, but you get 50 per cent of what your road ought to cost. That is going to have this effect: Every State commission that builds a road for which it is going to receive Government aid, which is cut down by the Secretary of Agriculture in the amount, will be subject to criticism by the people of the State, and the people of the State will go to the commissioner and ask him why he did not build the roads more cheaply. It is going to be a check on every State highway department.

Roads being built in this way in various places in 48 States is going to give the Secretary of Agriculture and his expert engineers data upon which he can rely and from which he can tell very quickly, many times without inspection whatever, whether the road has cost more than it ought to cost. The Secretary of Agriculture can offer suggestions to the various highway commissions, and under the powers given him in this bill he is absolutely sure that every dollar that the Government expends on the roads shall be met by a dollar that the State expends, and the Government and State will thus get two dollars' worth of road for every dollar that the Government puts in.

Mr. Chairman, people term this a pork-barrel proposition. Under a bill of this kind, why can not the Secretary of Agriculture see to it that roads are constructed just as cheaply as the Secretary of the Navy can see to it that battleships are constructed more cheaply than they can be constructed in any private navy yard? If this Government can do other matters in an economical way, why can not it build roads in an economical way? I think it can.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In the construction of highways, bridges and culverts are a considerable item of expense?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This bill provides for building highways only?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. No; it includes bridges and culverts as a part of the highway system. Some of the Eastern States were opposed to this bill before and are opposed to it now. They say that they are raising more money by taxation than they are getting back. This matter of internal improvements has been going on ever since this Government was started, and the interior of the country, the great agricultural part of the country, has had very few of these internal improvements, and I can not imagine any internal improvement that is going to benefit as many people as will the improvement of our highways. [Applause.] The only questions are whether this money that is expended will be expended in an economical and in an intelligent manner upon the roads, and whether it is fairly apportioned. Those ought to be the only two questions considered.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. As I understand the gentleman, there are three methods of apportionment?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Sixty-five thousand dollars arbitrarily fixed, population, and the length of the rural and star routes?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. All of these three are to be put together into an apportionment to any one State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. That being true, would it not be unfair to the great State of New York to give it only \$65,000 and to give \$65,000, say, to a State like Delaware?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do not think it would be any more unfair than to give two United States Senators to the State of New York and two to the State of Nevada.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. The basis of apportionment to the State is, first, population?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. And next, the length of routes?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. What relation does the arbitrary appropriation of \$65,000 to each State bear to either one of those necessities?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It simply helps the young States, like many of the Western States that are just building roads and have not a large road mileage and have not a large population. In figuring up the apportionment under the two items spoken of, it will be seen that some States that need roads, when they complete their roads it will help the whole road system of the United States, and those States are very poor and ought to have something upon some other basis than simply population and road mileage.

Mr. REAVIS. The only basis, as I understand it, then of the \$65,000, is that it is an arbitrary gift on the part of this committee?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Simply that each State as a unit shall have a fair amount.

Mr. REAVIS. Not based upon any necessity?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is based on necessity, and helps out these other two apportionments.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. What jurisdiction is maintained by the Government after the road has been established to see that it has been maintained or continued?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. This amount provides for maintenance and construction of the roads.

Mr. SLOAN. But after the money has been expended by the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. After it has been expended the States themselves have to look after it.

Mr. SLOAN. And the United States gives up this money and has no authority whatever over that road in any way for any length of time after having made the contribution.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. No.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman think that is fair to the Federal Government?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I think that is fair. I think it is for the interest of every locality to keep up the roads, for the interest of the State to keep up the roads, and when the State puts in a dollar as against a dollar that the Government puts in it is going to see that those roads are kept up in reasonable repair.



Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Suppose we pass this bill, where does the committee figure that they are going to get the money? How are you going to get the money first in the Treasury of the United States to start with? Under present conditions, where does the committee figure out it is going to get the money?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. We figure out we will get it in the same place where we get it for rivers and harbors—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We have not been getting it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. And are going to get it for the post offices. We were informed within a day or two we are going to have a lot of Federal post-office buildings, which are all right, probably; and we get the money for them from the same source; but we think this internal improvement is certainly more imperative than the improvement of many of our rivers and harbors or the building of post-office buildings at small towns.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will say to the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, if we get the money in the same place we have been getting the money under this administration for the improvement of rivers and harbors it is a useless performance to pass the bill of the gentleman. We have not been getting it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. In the Sixty-third Congress the committee got over \$50,000,000, and we only ask \$25,000,000. Then we passed a bill appropriating \$30,000,000 for a railroad up in Alaska for the benefit of 60,000 people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And we have not got it yet.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. We think it is not more than fair to the great rural population of this country which, when you include towns of 2,500 inhabitants, makes over half the population, 50,000,000 people, are entitled at this time to some consideration. That is the idea of this great improvement that it is going to help everybody. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am in hearty sympathy with what the gentleman is saying, and I understood him to say a moment ago that we are going to have a lot of Federal buildings. I would like to know where the gentleman gets that information. I am a member of that committee, and I have not heard of it.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The other day the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] gave a very learned speech here and told us the fact that we could look for Federal buildings.

Mr. GORDON. As far as he was concerned.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. And that is all right; I am not questioning it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am not questioning these other internal improvements, but I feel that a class of people whose property is taxed every year for more than \$50,000,000, the rural population of this country, the farmers—taxed over \$50,000,000 each year—that it is high time we paid some attention to them. [Applause.] I think it is time we built a few roads in this country to benefit them. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman about that, and that is one reason I am in favor of public buildings in the smaller towns, to which, as I inferred from the gentleman's statement, he is opposed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I want to finish up what I am saying, and then if I have any time I shall be glad to yield.

Now, we know that the cost of transportation is an important matter to everybody, to the people who dwell in cities as well as in the country, and they claim that about 40 per cent of the cost of every article to the consumer is the cost of transportation. Now, we have improved our waterways so that to-day we can carry a ton of freight 1,000 miles for \$1.25, we can carry a ton of freight in the United States over our railroads for something like 250 miles for \$1.25, but we can not carry a ton of freight on our wagon roads in the United States to exceed 5 miles for \$1.25. Now, if we hope to lessen the cost of transportation the wagon road is the place to lessen it. We pay to-day in the United States to carry a ton of freight over our rural highways over twice what it costs in any country in the world, and anyone who has thought upon this subject at all knows that our rural highways to-day are wholly inadequate

to meet the demands of the traffic that passes over them. I have in my State rivers that have been improved, in my own district, where hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended on those rivers to improve them, and there does not as much traffic go over those rivers in a year as goes over the rural highways that run parallel to those rivers in a week. If you can justify that proposition I would like to have it justified. I believe that it is going to benefit the people of the East in all the States that really opposed this bill in the last session, particularly east of the Allegheny Mountains. Those great States are dependent, somewhat at least, upon the prosperity of the great rural population, the great farming population of this country. They are as anxious about the crop of wheat or cotton or any other crop as the people of the West or the people of the South or any other agricultural community. They have had money for internal improvements. The great Panama Canal, that cost over \$400,000,000, undoubtedly benefited them more directly than it did the great interior or agricultural population of this country, but we have not hesitated in paying this. We are willing even to support, and have for 50 years, the highest kind of a protective tariff on the goods we manufacture, but at this time, after going along for 50 or 100 years, not having any improvements, we say that in making this appropriation for wagon roads it is not asking too much, even if they do not get as much money back as they have to pay out. I want to say I do not concede that the money that comes into the ports of entry of these Eastern States, or any State having a seaport, belongs to them. [Applause.] It belongs to this whole country, and the prosperity of the East or the West depends upon the prosperity of every State in the Union.

The State which I have the honor to represent is one of the agricultural States. Every year for the last few years the value of dairy products alone reached over \$100,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he can tell the committee under what process of reasoning the Committee on Roads reached the conclusion that incorporated cities of 2,000 population should have their streets constructed at the expense of the United States Government while all cities above that population are to be excluded from that provision?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The bill provides that in large villages and cities where the houses are 200 feet apart, and they are on a road that the Secretary of Agriculture believes is a part of a road system, some aid can be placed upon them, but all of this amount is safeguarded by the Secretary of Agriculture. You can not get a cent for any road unless he O. K.'s it and says that it is a road that ought to have Federal aid. He is not going to do foolish things. We have to place in every public official certain discretion and he exercises his sound judgment upon it, and we get very good service from our Federal departments.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman to answer this question.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I would not like to be interrupted on that question further. If the gentleman has another question, I will yield.

The gentleman comes from a large city and represents a large city population, but even in the large cities the road associations favor bills of this kind. There is not a State highway department or State aid in any of the States that applies to the large cities. Some of them give aid to cities as high as 2,000 inhabitants and no higher. Why? Because in cities of that kind they are part of a system of roads and they do not want this road fund to get into the large centers, because it would be swallowed up in the extensive improvements on the city streets and would be lost.

This bill is primarily—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to the fact that the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois refers to that provision as to the towns having a population exceeding 2,000, and that provision was included in the bill for the specific purpose

of including in the participation of this fund those cities in New England where the incorporated limits of a town cover many square miles. The purpose of the committee was not to exclude from participation under this bill that section of New England that is included within the incorporated limits of cities, but where the homes are more than 200 or 300 feet apart.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The gentleman from South Carolina is entirely correct.

Mr. MADDEN. That would require the Secretary of Agriculture to have inspectors in every town of the United States to find out every year how close the houses are together.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The State will take care of those things themselves. Every State highway commission that apportions these funds gives them to the rural communities. This road bill is primarily for the benefit of the rural highways and not for the city streets in the big cities.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman concede—

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield to interruptions.

Mr. MADDEN. This is not an interruption. I am just asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I refuse to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking this question in perfect good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to the floor, and the Chair hopes there will be no interruption.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. All the State laws have apportioned the road funds to the rural highways and not to the large cities. Some of them go far enough to include villages and cities of 2,000 inhabitants, and there is not a single State law in the United States, among all of the States, that goes so far as to appropriate money for city streets. The reason is that it would not be a fair thing in this bill to provide for city streets. As I say, it is primarily for the rural highway. The cities get many forms of Federal aid, many internal improvements. They get their post-office buildings. The city of Chicago has its fine Federal buildings that cost millions and millions of dollars. And now gentlemen from the cities, or some of them, object to giving the rural communities a little money on a very belated and necessary improvement like the improvement of our wagon roads. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those Representatives from a city who do not object to the country getting a fair proportion of all appropriations, and when this bill was up before I voted for it—

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I know you did.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of the statement he made a moment ago, as to how the farmers pay \$50,000,000 in taxes to the United States Government?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They pay their township taxes, and county taxes, and highway taxes, and pay a tremendous tax to your manufacturers. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I respond very promptly by saying that all residents of the city pay an enormous price for the products that come from the gentleman's farm, and the cost of living has gone up very high to consumers in the cities.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. You pay it to your commission merchants, who make as much as the farmer does.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be, and that is a matter for regulation by law. But let the gentleman answer my question as to how it is and where it is that the farmer pays \$50,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I have not said he paid it directly into the Treasury of the United States. How does the State of Pennsylvania pay the amount of money to this Federal road fund?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The State of Pennsylvania has, up to date, paid for its own roads, and so have the New England States.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I asked you the question, Has the State of Pennsylvania paid one cent directly into the United States Treasury except by way of an income tax or something of that kind?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has paid large sums into the United States Treasury in internal taxes and because of the improvement of rivers and harbors it is enabled to collect, and does collect, many millions in the form of customs duties.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Through our good roads we are going to benefit you in Pennsylvania the same as you benefit us. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I admit there may be a mutual benefit. We are interdependent, but my question referred to the farmers' payment of \$50,000,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I did not make any such statement. I said we paid taxes on \$50,000,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The farmer pays taxes in my State and in the gentleman's State, but not for Federal purposes. He pays taxes only for local purposes.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If the gentleman has supported the bill in the last Congress, he should do so in this Congress, and he will support this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I rose only to request the gentleman to be fair toward the various sections of the country, and not to attack those parts of the country through which the revenues of the country are collected—as to customs duties, one-third of the whole.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am not attacking them. I am simply saying we ought to halt in these other internal improvements until we have made a very necessary and belated improvement in our roads. All the people of the United States have been contributing to the internal improvements, such as rivers and harbors and other works, for a hundred years, and the only United States law or Federal law that was ever passed for roads was passed away back in Jefferson's administration, in which we appropriated \$7,000,000 for the great Cumberland Road; and that money was as well expended as any \$7,000,000 that was ever appropriated by this Government. [Applause.] It opened and started the great western march of the people of this country toward the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman and I agree as to that.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says he knows the city people pay enormous prices for the products of the farmers. Does he know that the Secretary of Agriculture, after a very careful investigation, reports that the farmer gets only approximately 50 per cent of the price paid by the consumer?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The gentleman from North Dakota is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The fact remains, however, that we pay enormously high prices in the cities for the products of the farmer. You have nothing on us in that respect.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I repeat, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] is entirely right in regard to the farmer getting only 50 per cent of the real selling price paid by the consumer of the product he raises.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will join the gentleman in attempting to remedy that condition as quickly as any other Member of the House.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Well, the Government is trying to work out that problem now, and I hope it is going to be successful. But it is certainly going to lessen the cost to the consumer when it will save an enormous amount of unnecessary cost in hauling products over bad roads. The Secretary of Agriculture says that in the hauling of the annual crop it really is a loss of something like \$100,000,000 in marketing the annual crop of from \$5,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000, caused by bad roads, and he says that the highest tax which the American people are paying to-day is the bad road or mud tax.

That is what this bill seeks to remedy. We have got over 2,000,000 miles of roads in the United States, and—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Not now. I can not yield.

I say we have over 2,000,000 miles of roads in the United States, and it is an enormous thing to contemplate—the building, in the first instance, the keeping in repair and seeing after the maintenance of all these roads. If the Federal Government appropriates this amount, this is going to act as a great educational factor, as we argued. We have a small Roads Bureau in the United States Government now, but the trouble is that so little money is appropriated for it that it can hardly get out a bulletin or make an investigation. If we appropriate \$25,000,000, that will be but a small thing for a State like Pennsylvania. That State will get something like a million and a half dollars from it. It may be a small thing, but it is going



to educate the people all over the United States as to road building. It is going to educate every State highway commission. The engineers have not yet figured out and gotten up a road that will stand the wear and tear of modern traffic. We are going to have the best engineers in the country working on that problem. In Pennsylvania, if you want macadam roads at \$30,000 a mile, you can have them. If you just want to maintain the roads already built and not build new ones, under this law you can spend the money you receive toward maintaining them. It is a law that is workable in all the 48 States of the Union. You can not make a hard-and-fast rule or specify a kind of road that will be good or a road system that will be workable in all the 48 States, because there are so many different conditions that a road that is good in the interior of Pennsylvania, for example, would bankrupt one of our Western States or agricultural communities.

This bill provides that the moneys shall be apportioned and expended as recommended by the various highway commissions of the States, and it is safeguarded by the Secretary of Agriculture, who stands back there with all the experience and investigation he gets from the engineers and road builders in the different States, and he does not let a dollar go out of the Treasury until he knows that a dollar has been expended by the States, and not only expended, but expended in an intelligent manner. Then only does he let it go. I do not see but that this Government would be amply safeguarded in passing a law of this kind.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is there a provision in this bill that the different States can not participate in this fund unless they contribute a proportionate part?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes. Every State has to pay. When a road proposition is presented by the State highway department to the Secretary of Agriculture, he is the judge of whether the Federal Government pays 30 or 50 per cent of what it can be built for. If it is a high-class road or macadam road, they will get probably 50 per cent. If it is a gravel road or dirt road, it may be 30 per cent. Then the State has got to pay the balance. If the Government gives 50 per cent, the State has got to pay 50 per cent. If the Government pays 30 per cent, the State has got to come forward and pay 70 per cent.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. Is it left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the amount which shall be paid by the Federal Government and the amount which shall be paid by the State?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. It is left to him to determine the per cent, which shall be between 30 and 50 per cent. On an expensive road he will undoubtedly allow a larger per cent than he will on a dirt road or a gravel road; yet in thousands of places in the United States the only road that is practicable and that can be built will be a plain dirt road, well graded and kept up. In some places where they have the material a gravel road will be the kind of road they will build. Right back of all this you have the State highway commission watching over that matter and reporting, and you have the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States and his experts to say what kind of a road shall be built and whether a particular road is one that should have Federal aid or not. I think that the money the Government is called upon to appropriate is safeguarded in every way, and that the Government can be sure that the money appropriated by it is going to be used wisely and economically.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to ask the gentleman why the committee did not place in this bill a provision appropriating the money so as to vitalize the bill?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Appropriations have to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The Roads Committee is not an appropriating committee. We have not the authority to recommend appropriations.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. The Roads Committee has no authority to make appropriations, and, of course, this bill will have to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DILLON. But Congress can appropriate the money?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Certainly.

Mr. DILLON. Then why does not it do that and vitalize this bill?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If Congress passes this bill, then the question of appropriating the money goes to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DILLON. And that will be the last of it?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What is the attitude of the Department of Agriculture and its Bureau of Public Roads with reference to this bill? Has it considered this bill, and what is its attitude?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I am informed that the Department of Agriculture favors this bill. I am also informed that the State highway commissioners of the various States, representing the State highway departments, met and got up a tentative bill that is substantially this bill. It may vary in some particulars, but on the whole it is practically this bill, and I know that a number of the highway commissions have written letters expressing their approval of this bill.

Mr. NORTON. If this bill passes, does it impose any obligation on the Committee on Appropriations to report, in the sundry civil appropriation bill, an appropriation of \$25,000,000 a year, or any amount?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Of course the Committee on Appropriations has got to act on this just the same as on other bills. As the gentleman well knows, the Roads Committee has no power to appropriate any money. The Roads Committee passed on this bill, and if it is the sense of this Congress that this bill should pass, I think there are enough Members who will favor it so that undoubtedly the Committee on Appropriations would recommend the appropriation.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANFORD. Am I to understand from the reading of this bill that there is any provision here that will require the several States before receiving Federal aid to spend any amount of money whatever in the construction of roads? That is, if the members of a community get together and do their share of the work—by convict labor, or by local labor, or in any other manner, if they produce the desired result—do they not become entitled to Federal aid when a certain portion of the road is finished, regardless of whether they have spent any money or not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They have got to present to the Secretary of Agriculture their system of roads.

Mr. SANFORD. They can do it in any way they want to, can they not?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They must present their plans and specifications. Then, if they accept the terms imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture, they can go back and build their road, and the Secretary of Agriculture does not care how they build it. If they present to him a good road according to plans and specifications and show that it cost so much money, then he turns over to them the amount that the Government has promised. But if they spend more money upon that road than it ought to cost they do not get anything for the excess of cost. They get exactly what that road can be built for if it is built in the most economical way.

Mr. SANFORD. The point I am making is that a State or a community can build their road without spending one dollar, doing it by convict labor, for instance, or local labor.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If they build it by convict labor, that represents so much labor or so much money. If I am riding over a road down in Kentucky, if it is a good road I, as a citizen of the United States, do not care how it has been built, and if the State has put in a dollar's worth of work, and the Government of the United States has put in a dollar, and we have two dollars' worth of road, that is all I care about.

Mr. SANFORD. If we spend \$25,000,000 through the Federal Government, we will give employment to that much labor, as a reward for the local labor of the various communities. Does not that seem reasonable?

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. They simply hire that work to be done. The convict system of labor is employed in only a few of the States of the Union to work on the roads. We would rather have convicts work on the roads than to have them work in competition with free labor in other directions.

Mr. SANFORD. I do not mean convict labor particularly. I mean that so long as the work is done by the State, the Government does not care how it is done.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. If they hire local labor and pay for it, they will have to spend that much money to do the work, and I should not think it would make any difference to the gentleman from New York whether the State as a unit



appropriated the money or whether the different localities appropriated the money. We want a law that will be workable in all the States of the Union. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in somewhat a lonely minority on my committee in opposing this measure, because I believe it is an unwise policy for the Federal Government to undertake. After reading the speeches in the debates in the last Congress and listening to statements made by the honorable chairman of the committee and my associate who has just concluded, members of the Roads Committee, I am convinced that the only thing the Federal-aid road bill will not accomplish is the cure of measles and the eradication of the seven-year locusts. [Laughter.]

You would think to hear the statements made by gentlemen on the floor of this Chamber at the last session that if you can get Federal aid for highways all the evils in many communities of our several States are to be wiped out. I say that it is an unwise policy for this Government to undertake this thing at this particular time.

The chairman of the committee said that good roads have become a burning question in many of the Western States. Ah, yes, Mr. Chairman, a burning question, but not so burning that they are willing to appropriate their own money to build their roads and maintain their highways. He says there is a great public demand for this measure. Of course, Mr. Chairman, there is always a great public demand whenever there is an opportunity for communities or States to reach into the Federal Treasury and extract funds therefrom.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to inquire whether there is a road in the United States except the Cumberland highway that was not constructed by the farmers and the ordinary laborers and the people in the States without Federal aid?

Mr. WALSH. That is true, Mr. Chairman, but I say that these many States throughout this country can well afford to build their own roads, that it is no part of the Federal Government's duty or obligation to construct highways in whole or in part for the States. One of the bad features of this bill is that the very States that have expended millions of dollars in the construction of their own highways will be called upon to contribute heavily for the construction of roads in other sections of the country. Take the States of Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, yes Kansas and California, where they have modern highways, and you will find that in computing the proportion of direct taxes—and it will be by direct taxes that this appropriation will be made up—they pay a large proportion of the amount.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman says that the money that will go to pay these expenses will be raised by direct taxation. What does the gentleman mean; how does he mean to differentiate these taxes?

Mr. WALSH. I mean that the revenue of this country secured under the present tariff law is insufficient to carry on the functions of the various departments of this Government, and this administration has been forced to levy a war tax to help pay the expenses of the Government. If you add \$25,000,000 more to the expenses of the Government, necessarily it must come out of the direct taxes which have been levied.

Mr. BLACK. But how does the gentleman know that this particular fund will come out of the direct taxes?

Mr. WALSH. What difference does it make, Mr. Chairman, whether it comes out directly or indirectly, you will levy the tax and the people will have to pay it. I point out to the gentleman in this connection that of the \$52,000,000 secured by these special taxes during the year ending June 30, 1915, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania paid \$31,140,000.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for another question? Does the gentleman think that ought to be the criterion for public expenses—what a single State pays into the Treasury?

Mr. WALSH. I think when you are embarking on a policy entirely new, a plan entirely novel, to take up a matter which has heretofore been handled by the States independently of the Federal Government, that that certainly should be taken into account, and the further fact that the several States have expended millions of dollars improving their highways also should be taken into account when other States which have expended comparatively small sums for this purpose are asking for a contribution for internal improvements, such as is contemplated by this proposed measure.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. KELLEY. Does not the gentleman think the subject of transportation, whether on the railroads or on the rivers or on the highways, ought to be treated as a whole? In other words, practically all of the merchandise that is hauled over the railroads must be hauled over the highways, and if it is proper to assist in building railroads to a large extent all over the country as we have in times past, why is it not proper to assist in the development of highways which lead up to the stations? [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. In answer to that, I do not think it is proper, because there is no analogy between the two situations.

Mr. KELLEY. Why not? It seems to me that there is. Will the gentleman state in what particular the analogy fails.

Mr. WALSH. In this particular, because this bill is not confined to any particular road used in interstate commerce or in roads running from railroads to any particular point. Any little cow path or lane or alley, in so far as it may be outside the limits of any city, incorporated village or town, can receive Federal aid under this bill. It is not to be directed to thoroughfares from one State into another, but any little road, if it starts nowhere and goes elsewhere, can receive aid.

Mr. KELLEY. To make my question clear, if it is proper for the Federal Government to assist in building a road to carry produce over a road from city to city, why is it not proper for the Federal Government to assist in constructing a road from the farm to the station?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have not as yet admitted that it is proper for the Federal Government to construct a road from the farm to the city or from the city to the farm, nor to aid in the construction of railroads in the States.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman think that if the appropriation is once made out of the Federal Treasury for the construction of highways it will absolutely paralyze all local movement, and that no community will ever thereafter be willing to do anything for itself.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, that is one of the thoughts which I had in mind when I undertook here in my place to defend my position in submitting this report. I intended to express that thought, but I have been diverted by these many interruptions.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if I may answer the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN]?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The answer is found on page 3 of the bill in the provision that when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that the construction of a road has been finished he shall then pay the Government contribution, so that the State can not get any of the Government money until after it has complied with that provision and paid out the State money.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied the gentleman from Massachusetts can answer that question.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must decline to yield at the present time. I would like to get along with my remarks. Possibly later when the opportunity offers I will be glad to withstand the bombardment of questions from these gentlemen who are so anxious and willing to admit that their own States have failed miserably in the duty which was laid upon them when their States were formed, to construct their own highways, as many States have done.

Take the great State of New York, for example. That State has expended millions and millions of dollars in constructing a modern system of highways, and would contribute several millions of dollars toward this appropriation, but it would receive back from its own contribution only a small amount, a little over \$1,000,000, as its allotment under this bill, and yet it is contended that this distribution is equitable. Mr. Chairman, I believe the reason why the arbitrary amount of \$65,000 was fixed in the bill is simply as the darky would say, to take the "cuss" off the whole proposition; and if it were not for that \$65,000, Delaware would receive only \$38,000, under the bill as drawn; Nevada, \$36,000; Rhode Island, \$74,000; Utah, \$73,000; Wyoming, \$60,000; Arizona, \$52,000; Idaho, \$105,000; and Vermont, \$122,000.

Let me call your attention to the definition of what a rural post roads is, as contained in this bill. It is stated that the term "rural post roads"—

shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is, or might be, carried—

Mr. Chairman, I ask some one to point out a single highway in the whole Union that can not be considered a rural post road



under that definition, because the mail might be carried over it at some time. The bill continues:

Outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000, and in such cities, towns, and boroughs having a population exceeding 2,000 along streets and roads where the houses average more than 200 feet apart.

Mr. Chairman, they actually seek in this bill to set that up as a definition of a rural post road, which is to cover the appropriation of Federal funds in the construction of highways throughout these United States. I say it is defective, and the committee could very well have said that they will appropriate money simply for the aid of highways in the several States of the Union. Another feature of this measure which I submit is vicious in its import is that the Congress of the United States says to the several States of the Union: You have got to have a certain department in running your own affairs; you must necessarily have a highway commission within your borders, irrespective of whether the people of your State desire a highway commission or a highway department; if you want Federal aid you have got to establish one, and it has got to be called presumably by that name and under that designation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, another defect in the bill is that once having appropriated money, and that money having been expended, the Government has no further supervision over the highways. The Government gives the State this money, and after the road is constructed and the money is paid the Government retains no jurisdiction or control over the highway, and that highway the very next year, for all that Congress knows, may be discontinued or abandoned or used in some other way or for some other purpose, so that the money that the Congress has appropriated and expended for this purpose will have become wasted.

If this is a wise policy to adopt, there should have been some provision for the control or supervision in the future. In my opinion, appropriating the money to aid in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads is a shallow pretext, because the concluding section of the bill makes it clear that it is done simply to aid the farmers of the country; and, in so far as that is true, this is class legislation. I am not criticizing the farmers of the country, because we have farmers in the New England States—in "effete" New England, as it was termed here the other day—and the farmers in the New England States have been in the past and will be in the future ready and willing to assume and bear their burdens by way of increased taxes and build their own roads from their farms to the railroad stations or from their farms to the post offices—and under this bill no allowance is made for what they have done in this direction heretofore—but to seek to appropriate money on the pretext that you are doing it to aid rural free delivery or to improve rural post roads, in view of the words in the next to the last section of the bill, shows conclusively that it is not done to aid in the delivery of the United States mails or to build up a great system of highways for the great Postal Service of the country, but is done to relieve a certain class of our population in certain sections of our vast country of burdens which in other sections of the country have been patiently, if not cheerfully, borne by individuals of the same class. And I say it is to the glory and credit of the New England farmer, and the farmers of other States where large sums of money have been expended, that they have borne this burden in the shape of taxation, and have, in addition, contributed their just share of taxation for other improvements, local, State, and national, without a whimper. The Massachusetts farmers, in common with the farmers of other New England States and the farmers of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, and California are no weaklings, Mr. Chairman, and they are reaping the benefits of expenditures to which they have contributed without a thought of a partnership between their State and the Federal Government.

But if it is done to relieve the farmer of the burdens which they ought to be willing to bear, if there is this great demand, and if it is going to lift these great burdens from the farmers, and it is going to result in this tremendous financial benefit to them, why should they not be willing in the States of the West or the States of the South or the States or any other section of the country to bear the burden of increased taxation and have the roads built under State supervision? The advocates of this measure talk about the State appropriating half the money. Why, Mr. Chairman, if they are willing to appropriate half the money, if the Government should put in half, why are not these States willing to appropriate their half at once or in the near future without Federal aid and show to the country at large that they have made an honest effort, a conscientious endeavor, to remedy a defect which has existed owing to the lack of a modern system of highways in their respective communities? We have proceeded in this country here-

tofore, as I before stated, with the building of roads as a matter of State duty and State jurisdiction, and we would be as well justified in appropriating money here in this Congress to build schoolhouses or town halls and to take care of the paupers of the many States of this Union as we would be to step in and appropriate money to build these roads. If this is to become a law, I submit that if those States are sincere in their effort to have improved highways there should be some provision inserted in this bill whereby the States which receive this money shall repay at least a part of it back to the Federal Treasury.

I have pointed out in my minority views printed to accompany the report on this bill, Mr. Chairman, some of the inconsistencies and discrepancies which occur in the apportionment of the money under the provisions of this bill, and I want to call attention to the fact that, although this bill is supposed to improve roads in rural communities, no allowance is made in computing the population. No allowance is made for the population in the great cities of these various States. They are all included in the total of population and in the ratio which the population of that State bears to the population of the entire country. But if this is to aid the rural communities, the population should be apportioned upon the ratio which the rural population bears to the population of the entire country, so that this money will go to those communities where the need may be expressed as great. For instance, Colorado, with a population of nearly 800,000, is allowed \$252,000; Oregon, with 672,000 population, gets \$248,000; North and South Dakota, with a population combined of less than 600,000, get \$335,000 and \$337,000, respectively—

Mr. DILON. That is not right.

Mr. WALSH. While Connecticut, with over 1,000,000 of population, is allowed but \$258,000. The mileage comparison is the same and the same discrepancies occur; and in the star-route mileage, as set forth in this bill here, in the table accompanying the report, the same discrepancies occur. Rhode Island, with 87.61 miles of star routes, gets \$139,000. Wyoming, with 4,137 miles of star-route highways, only gets \$125,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, at least some effort should be made in appropriating Federal money to see that it goes to States which at least try to improve their own system of highways. In 1913 the State of Alabama, as a State, for State highways, spent \$127,000, and under this allotment here she would be allowed to receive \$579,000. Delaware spent \$30,000, and is allotted under this bill \$103,000. California spent \$2,000,000 and over in 1913, and yet she gets but \$504,000. Connecticut spent \$3,483,000, and she gets but \$258,000. Florida and Georgia spent not a cent, as States, for highways in 1913, and yet get \$202,000 for Florida and \$722,000 for Georgia.

The following States made no expenditures for State highway funds in 1913: Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. The total amount of State expenditures for highways in 1913, Mr. Chairman, in the United States only amounted to \$37,437,000, and of this amount the States of California, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and even Washington, in the far Northwest, contributed of that \$37,000,000 the sum of \$30,000,000. So you can see the many States that have neglected the road problem. Of course they can say that there has been a great increase in highway commissions and highway departments in some of these Western States, but it is interesting to notice that this increase in these highway commissions has been coincident with the introduction of Federal-aid road bills in the Congress of the United States. I say it is because these highway commissions have sought to expend or to assist in the expenditure of Federal aid.

Now, Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the Government having the constitutional authority to expend money for post offices and post roads. That may or may not be true. There may or may not be some doubt upon that question, but irrespective of that, whenever the United States Government undertakes to expend money for improvements they see to it that in expending that money that it is wisely and judiciously expended; and furthermore, they exercise, after the expenditure is made, some degree of control, and that is not the case with this law.

They say that because the United States uses these highways and byways in carrying the rural mail to the patrons of the country post offices that they should therefore aid to the extent of one-half of the expense in constructing and repairing those roads. I say, sir, that if this bill and its purpose is to be based upon the theory that because the Government uses the highways it should therefore contribute to the maintenance and constructing of them, that then the Government should only contribute its fair share toward maintaining and constructing these highways,

taking into account all the uses to which the highways are put; and if that were the theory upon which this legislation were to stand you would find, instead of paying from 30 to 50 per cent of the cost, that this Government would only pay from 1 to 10 per cent of the cost, and no such large sum would be required to be appropriated.

I say, sir, that to enact this legislation will discourage rather than encourage road building under State auspices, because once you get Federal expenditure or Federal appropriation or Federal participation in carrying out any of the great functions of the Government the growth and tendency of the times have been to discourage doing or performing that function under State auspices and to gradually and slowly turn that power, authority, or duty over to Federal supervision and control. And I say that under this bill that will inevitably follow. There may not be men here who will see it, but there will come a time if we launch the Government upon this program when the States will take the stand that if their highways become run down and out of repair that because the United States Government at one time expended money for the construction or maintenance of those roads they will not do anything more for them until the United States Government comes to their rescue.

I say, sir, that this legislation is not wise, and I want to call the attention of the gentlemen on this side of the House especially to the fact that this is one of the measures which for several years has been in the platform of the Democratic Party, while the Republican Party has never incorporated a plank for Federal aid, but has simply asserted its belief in good roads and recommended the improvement of them to the several States of the Union. And I am not surprised at the frantic endeavors of the Democracy to fulfill their platform promise in this respect, because it is in striking contrast with their efforts in the past to put into practice their promises upon one or two other doctrines laid down in that immortal document, and I might refer perhaps to the one-term plank as to the presidential term of office.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I say, sir, that it is well for this Congress at this time to stop and consider whether, in view of the many

important questions that are pressing for consideration, whether in view of the present condition of the Federal Treasury as it has been enunciated upon both sides of this Chamber, this country is in a condition to launch out upon an entirely new policy involving an expenditure of \$25,000,000. But if it is well to set forth upon this unknown sea, I submit it would be much better for this House to reduce that appropriation materially—down to less than \$5,000,000—and see what will happen with that kind of an appropriation and the consequent apportionment that could be made thereunder. But I object, because I honestly and sincerely believe that this is not a policy for which we as Members of this great body ought to stand under the present conditions in this country, and in view of the fact that the sole demand, as it were, seems to come from States which in the past have been unwilling to aid themselves and now see a chance to have Federal aid from the United States Treasury. [Applause.]

I desire to submit the following comparative tables and invite the attention of the proponents of the measure to them:

#### Comparisons.

##### MILEAGE COMPARISONS.

Louisiana, with 0.75 per cent of combined routes, gets.....	\$345,064
West Virginia, with 1.19 per cent of combined routes, gets.....	340,688
Montana, with 0.76 per cent of combined routes, gets.....	192,998

##### RURAL FREE DELIVERY MILEAGE.

Alabama, 25,845 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	579,180
Kentucky, 18,765 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	580,274
New Jersey, 7,149 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	438,054
Vermont, 7,610 miles rural free delivery routes, gets.....	187,528

##### STAR-ROUTE MILEAGE.

Illinois, 717.77 miles, gets.....	1,372,330
Montana, 6,541 miles, gets.....	792,998
Rhode Island, 87.61 miles, gets.....	139,392
Wyoming, 4,137.03 miles, gets.....	125,170
Connecticut, 4,724 miles, gets.....	253,168
Delaware, 359.06 miles, gets.....	258,638

Yet Pennsylvania, with 8.36 per cent of population and 4.48 per cent of rural free delivery and star routes, and receiving \$1,469,696, is given \$65,000, the same as the smaller States; also New York, with 9,113,614 population, 9.94 per cent, and 4.04 per cent of combined routes, receiving \$1,372,330, receives \$65,000, the same as Nevada and other small States.

TABLE 1.—State highway expenditures to Jan. 1, 1915.  
[Prepared by U. S. Department of Agriculture.]

State.	Year original State-aid law passed.	Expenditures in 1914.							Total State money expended for road work from outset to Jan. 1, 1915.	State money available for road work, 1915.	
		Local funds expended in road work by counties, townships, and districts.	Joint funds (State and local units).			Road work done solely at expense of State.	Total of all State money expended for road work.	Total of State funds and joint funds.			Total of State funds, joint funds, and local funds.
			Local unit's share.	State's share.	Total joint fund.						
Alabama.....	1911	\$2,795,000	\$160,693	\$170,232	\$330,925		\$168,232	\$330,925	\$3,125,925	\$460,271	\$144,000
Arizona.....	1909	603,608				\$406,125	406,125	406,125	1,009,733	563,210	396,883
Arkansas.....	1913	2,332,368			115,000		115,000	115,000	2,447,368	140,000	25,000
California.....	1895	9,495,281				5,175,333	5,175,333	5,175,333	14,670,614	8,209,942	7,000,000
Colorado.....	1909	1,621,850	678,225	301,274	979,499		301,274	979,499	2,601,449	821,751	85,000
Connecticut.....	1895	1,400,000	265,125	1,307,381	1,672,506	2,124,276	3,431,657	3,696,782	5,996,782	14,934,176	1,000,000
Delaware.....	1903	360,411	30,000	31,000	61,000		31,000	61,000	421,411	193,695	30,000
Florida.....	1915	3,450,000							3,450,000		
Georgia.....	1908	12,500,000							2,500,000		
Idaho.....	1905	1,265,000	43,466	49,812	93,278		49,812	93,278	1,358,278	372,812	200,000
Illinois.....	1905	7,102,977	446,702	387,989	\$34,691		387,989	\$34,691	7,937,668	867,989	2,100,000
Indiana.....		13,258,761							13,258,761		
Iowa.....	1904	11,363,000		74,000	74,000		74,000	74,000	11,437,000	175,000	100,000
Kansas.....	1911	5,427,424		9,080	9,080		9,080	9,080	5,436,504	20,000	11,000
Kentucky.....	1912	1,700,000		18,000	18,000		18,000	18,000	1,718,000	43,000	600,000
Louisiana.....	1910	4,000,000	300,320	161,186	461,506		161,186	461,506	4,461,506	461,506	145,000
Maine.....	1901	1,863,000	375,731	467,149	842,880	831,716	1,298,965	1,674,596	3,537,596	4,855,864	1,090,000
Maryland.....	1898	2,000,000	256,845	356,845	713,690	4,283,768	4,640,613	4,997,458	6,997,458	14,253,142	4,572,000
Massachusetts.....	1892	3,318,742	241,838	242,560	484,398	2,217,469	2,460,029	2,701,867	6,020,609	10,365,425	2,437,000
Michigan.....	1905	6,715,000	2,082,612	657,264	2,739,876	61,348	718,612	2,801,224	9,516,224	2,207,701	1,700,000
Minnesota.....	1905	4,272,244	2,643,621	1,309,956	3,953,577		1,309,956	3,953,577	8,225,821	2,708,174	1,770,742
Mississippi.....		2,850,000							2,850,000		
Missouri.....	1907	18,000,000		277,253	277,253		277,253	277,253	8,277,253	1,421,983	350,000
Montana.....	1913	2,553,773		13,516	13,516		13,516	13,516	2,567,289	16,000	25,000
Nebraska.....	1911	3,347,062					36,783		3,347,062	257,850	100,000
Nevada.....	1911	240,000							240,000		
New Hampshire.....	1903	1,250,000	301,288	491,520	792,808	9,365	500,885	802,173	2,052,173	2,593,450	400,000
New Jersey.....	1891	3,000,000	2,235,976	1,306,596	3,542,572		1,306,596	3,542,572	6,542,572	2,192,268	1,300,000
New Mexico.....	1909	371,196	40,281	115,732	156,013		115,732	156,013	527,209	510,833	175,000
New York.....	1898	7,741,142	6,655,072	8,544,126	15,199,198	6,950,133	15,494,259	22,149,331	29,890,473	82,638,729	15,000,000
North Carolina.....	1901	3,930,000		5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	3,935,000	28,500	10,000
North Dakota.....	1909	2,365,000							2,365,000		

<sup>1</sup> Data approximate.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$2,000 paid to county for bridges, but not reported as expended.

<sup>3</sup> Data for fiscal year.

<sup>4</sup> July 1, 1912, to Jan. 1, 1915.

<sup>5</sup> No money aid for construction.

<sup>6</sup> Data includes the State expenditure of \$150,920 on 519 miles of State mountain roads, divided as follows: Construction, \$54,866; maintenance, \$89,713; engineering, \$2,844; and administration, \$3,446.

<sup>7</sup> Data from State comptroller's report.

<sup>8</sup> State highway department provided for beginning Oct. 1, 1915.

<sup>9</sup> State aid in road construction beginning 1915.

<sup>10</sup> Data from the State auditor's report.

<sup>11</sup> State aid in bridge construction only.



TABLE 1.—State highway expenditures to Jan. 1, 1915—Continued.

State.	Year original State-aid law passed.	Expenditures in 1914.								Total State money expended for road work from outset to Jan. 1, 1915.	State money available for road work, 1915.
		Local funds expended in road work by counties, townships, and districts.	Joint funds (State and local units).			Road work done solely at expense of State.	Total of all State money expended for road work.	Total of State funds and joint funds.	Total of State funds, joint funds, and local funds.		
			Local unit's share.	State's share.	Total joint fund.						
Ohio.....	1904	\$8,500,000	\$906,543	\$1,855,338	\$2,761,882	.....	\$1,855,338	\$2,761,882	\$11,261,882	\$5,123,671	\$3,300,000
Oklahoma <sup>2</sup> .....	1911	3,375,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,000	.....	3,375,000	20,323	15,000
Oregon.....	1913	5,155,657	1,718,000	10,697	1,728,697	\$178,278	188,975	1,906,975	7,062,632	188,975	233,000
Pennsylvania.....	1903	5,500,091	657,437	1,976,768	2,634,205	2,290,284	<sup>2</sup> 4,354,666	4,924,489	10,424,580	24,259,954	5,000,000
Rhode Island.....	1902	385,000	.....	.....	.....	199,598	199,598	199,598	584,598	3,703,065	180,000
South Carolina.....	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....
South Dakota.....	1911	1,421,501	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,421,501	.....	.....
Tennessee <sup>4</sup> .....	1915	2,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,500,000	.....	.....
Texas.....	.....	18,750,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,750,000	.....	.....
Utah <sup>5</sup> .....	1909	1,750,000	249,204	157,732	406,936	.....	157,732	406,936	1,156,936	688,732	100,000
Vermont.....	1898	723,011	300,000	458,456	758,456	.....	458,456	758,456	1,481,467	3,186,419	400,000
Virginia.....	1906	2,148,436	1,243,432	523,578	1,767,010	.....	523,578	1,767,010	3,915,446	2,186,895	520,000
Washington <sup>6</sup> .....	1905	14,000,000	.....	1,343,431	1,343,431	877,700	2,221,131	2,221,131	6,221,131	7,117,769	2,167,583
West Virginia <sup>7</sup> .....	1909	2,388,000	144,000	.....	144,000	.....	3,766	144,000	2,532,000	<sup>7</sup> 121,766	11,800
Wisconsin.....	1911	4,519,000	3,117,329	1,482,379	4,599,708	.....	1,482,379	4,599,708	9,118,708	2,829,486	1,215,000
Wyoming.....	1911	426,448	.....	.....	.....	.....	6,237	.....	426,448	38,237	5,000
Total.....		174,035,083	25,193,740	24,220,850	49,414,591	25,605,393	49,968,643	75,019,984	249,055,067	211,859,163	54,884,000

<sup>1</sup> Data approximate.<sup>2</sup> Educational and advisory.<sup>3</sup> Includes \$87,714 for surveys and plotting State routes, county road maps, etc., not classed among items given.<sup>4</sup> State highway department provided for by act of legislature, 1915.<sup>5</sup> Data from State comptroller's report.<sup>6</sup> Figures given are one-half of the expenditures for the period Apr. 1, 1913, to Apr. 1, 1915.<sup>7</sup> Of this, \$118,090 was returned to counties in 1911 by act of legislature.

TABLE 2.—Distribution of expenditures under State control for the year 1914.

State.	Expenditure of joint funds of State and local units.					Work done under State control or inspection.					Expenditure of State funds for work done solely at expense of State.					
	Contribution from State funds					Contribution from local funds.					Construction roads and bridges.	Maintenance.	Engineering and inspection.	Administration.	Miscellaneous equipment.	Total State expense.
	Construction roads and bridges.	Maintenance.	Engineering and inspection.	Administration.	Miscellaneous equipment, etc.	Total from State.	Construction.	Maintenance.	Total from local units.							
Alabama.....	<sup>1</sup> \$160,412	\$320	(?)	\$8,200	\$1,300	\$170,232	\$100,693	.....	\$160,693	.....	\$301,173	\$14,670	\$14,569	\$19,161	\$56,552	\$406,125
Arizona.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Arkansas.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
California.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Colorado.....	285,851	.....	(?)	13,501	1,922	301,274	609,863	.....	678,225	.....	4,630,895	142,697	137,177	174,699	89,865	5,175,333
Connecticut.....	1,307,381	(*)	.....	.....	.....	1,307,381	265,125	.....	265,125	.....	1,015,536	925,332	135,774	47,634	.....	2,124,276
Delaware.....	30,000	.....	.....	1,000	.....	31,000	30,000	.....	30,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Florida <sup>2</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Georgia <sup>3</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Idaho.....	21,733	.....	21,713	6,366	.....	49,812	43,466	.....	43,466	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Illinois.....	281,702	.....	(?)	51,735	54,552	387,989	446,702	.....	446,702	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Indiana <sup>4</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Iowa <sup>5</sup> .....	.....	.....	50,000	10,000	14,000	74,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kansas <sup>6</sup> .....	.....	.....	8,130	.....	950	9,080	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kentucky.....	.....	.....	9,000	6,000	3,000	18,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Louisiana.....	123,962	487	21,855	13,208	1,674	161,186	298,859	1,461	300,320	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maine.....	375,452	60,246	31,451	.....	.....	467,149	338,016	37,715	375,731	688,355	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Maryland.....	356,845	.....	.....	.....	.....	356,845	356,845	.....	356,845	3,768,037	341,877	131,689	30,326	11,839	57,812	4,283,768
Massachusetts.....	242,560	.....	.....	.....	.....	242,560	241,838	.....	241,838	1,125,512	805,723	175,343	50,986	59,905	.....	2,217,469
Michigan.....	590,716	13,035	36,167	11,808	5,538	657,264	2,032,612	50,000	2,082,612	61,348	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	61,348
Minnesota.....	963,547	202,624	131,601	12,184	.....	1,309,956	2,523,134	120,487	2,643,621	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mississippi <sup>7</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Missouri.....	175,885	93,802	.....	7,566	.....	277,253	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Montana <sup>8</sup> .....	.....	850	.....	7,542	.....	13,516	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nebraska <sup>9</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nevada <sup>10</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Hampshire.....	271,767	157,155	.....	11,995	50,603	491,520	225,000	76,288	301,288	9,365	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,365
New Jersey.....	558,027	679,969	18,600	.....	50,000	1,306,596	770,715	1,465,261	2,235,976	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Mexico.....	115,732	.....	.....	.....	.....	115,732	40,281	.....	40,281	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New York.....	3,358,625	<sup>15</sup> 185,501	.....	.....	.....	8,544,126	3,239,473	3,415,599	6,655,072	5,258,833	28,000	<sup>16</sup> 1,230,254	<sup>17</sup> 907,520	125,526	.....	6,950,133
North Carolina <sup>18</sup> .....	.....	.....	3,000	1,250	750	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
North Dakota <sup>19</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ohio.....	1,363,975	232,890	108,907	83,139	66,427	1,855,338	906,543	.....	906,543	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oklahoma <sup>20</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oregon.....	10,697	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,697	1,718,000	.....	1,718,000	161,475	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Pennsylvania.....	<sup>21</sup> 1,542,323	343,726	90,719	.....	.....	1,976,768	657,437	.....	657,437	<sup>22</sup> 574,312	1,344,780	45,925	266,206	59,061	.....	2,290,284
Rhode Island.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	28,440	146,807	19,351	5,000	.....	.....	199,598
South Carolina <sup>23</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
South Dakota <sup>24</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Tennessee <sup>25</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Texas <sup>26</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Utah.....	120,809	.....	( <sup>27</sup> )	6,750	30,173	157,732	249,204	.....	249,204	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Vermont.....	318,456	140,000	.....	.....	.....	458,456	120,000	180,000	300,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Virginia.....	<sup>28</sup> 474,684	.....	48,894	( <sup>29</sup> )	.....	523,578	1,243,432	.....	1,243,432	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Washington.....	<sup>30</sup> 1,300,514	42,917	.....	.....	.....	1,343,431	.....	.....	.....	733,779	25,691	75,927	32,859	9,444	.....	877,700
West Virginia <sup>31</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	144,000	.....	144,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wisconsin.....	1,395,379	.....	( <sup>32</sup> )	87,000	.....	1,482,379	3,117,329	.....	3,117,329	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wyoming <sup>33</sup> .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total.....	15,744,835	7,152,672	605,887	351,827	363,431	24,220,850	19,778,567	5,415,173	25,193,740	18,357,060	3,775,577	2,009,409	993,843	469,504	.....	25,605,393

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$2,000 paid to county for bridges, but not reported as expended.<sup>2</sup> Engineering included in administration.<sup>3</sup> Engineering paid by counties.<sup>4</sup> Included in trunk-line maintenance.<sup>5</sup> Town pays one-fourth of maintenance on State aid.<sup>6</sup> No State highway department, 1914.<sup>7</sup> Convict labor to counties.<sup>8</sup> No State highway department.<sup>9</sup> Supervisory.<sup>10</sup> Educational and advisory.<sup>11</sup> State aid in bridge construction only.<sup>12</sup> Maintenance of State convict road camps.<sup>13</sup> Of this, \$1,816,119 was for State aid to towns.<sup>14</sup> Engineering and administration expenditures include all State-aid work.<sup>15</sup> Includes \$200,000 bonus to townships.<sup>16</sup> Includes \$73,393 for purchase of toll roads.<sup>17</sup> Engineering included in cost of construction.<sup>18</sup> Administration included in engineering.<sup>19</sup> Permanent highways.

TABLE 3.—State highway mileage, Jan. 1, 1915.

State.	Total all surfaced roads in State (approximate).	Total all public roads in State.	Per centage of surfaced roads in State.	State and State-aid roads built in 1914.	Total all State and State-aid roads built to Jan. 1, 1915.	Roads maintained with State aid, 1914.
	Miles.	Miles.	Per ct.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Alabama.....	5,491	49,639	11.1	1113	399	
Arizona.....	400	2,597	6.7	210	247	122
Arkansas.....	1,085	36,445	3.0	(9)		
California.....	9,388	48,069	19.5	406	1,124	919
Colorado.....	655	30,571	2.1	248	655	
Connecticut.....	3,300	12,582	26.2	199	1,282	1,125
Delaware.....	241	3,000	8.0	10	144	
Florida.....	2,625	17,954	14.6	(9)		
Georgia.....	12,500	83,986	14.9	(9)		
Idaho.....	611	18,406	3.3	70	100	
Illinois.....	9,000	94,141	9.6	99	284	
Indiana.....	26,831	63,370	42.3	(10)		
Iowa.....	2,505	104,027	2.4	(11)		
Kansas.....	1,170	111,536	1.0	(12)		
Kentucky.....	10,636	58,000	18.3	(13)		
Louisiana.....	697	24,962	2.8	75	299	38
Maine.....	3,264	25,528	12.8	260	1,323	648
Maryland.....	2,706	17,025	15.9	330	978	787
Massachusetts.....	8,928	17,272	51.7	184	1,113	967
Michigan.....	8,859	68,906	12.8	694	2,437	1,754
Minnesota.....	16,206	91,890	6.8	305	4,242	8,364
Mississippi.....	1,800	44,072	4.1	(16)		
Missouri.....	8,000	120,000	6.6	(16)		6,250
Montana.....	100	23,319	0.4	(15)		
Nebraska.....	250	80,338	0.3	(15)		
Nevada.....	65	12,751	0.5	(16)		
New Hampshire.....	1,025	15,116	6.8	149	1,024	875
New Jersey.....	4,500	14,842	30.3	102	1,935	2,000
New Mexico.....	900	16,920	5.3	50	357	
New York.....	22,398	80,112	27.9	863	5,167	4,000
North Carolina.....	6,166	49,802	12.4	(15)		
North Dakota.....	200	61,593	0.3	(15)		
Ohio.....	28,312	83,681	33.8	151	569	340
Oklahoma.....	500	71,325	0.7			
Oregon.....	3,994	42,990	9.3	125	309	
Pennsylvania.....	2,976	87,387	4.5	360	1,889	6,882
Rhode Island.....	1,246	2,121	58.8	2	325	325
South Carolina.....	4,888	45,549	17.3	(9)		
South Dakota.....	290	56,354	0.5	(15)		
Tennessee.....	5,554	45,913	12.1	(9)		
Texas.....	9,780	128,971	7.6	(16)		
Utah.....	1,653	7,970	20.7	66	1,072	
Vermont.....	3,278	15,082	22.7	200	1,631	4,252
Virginia.....	4,482	43,399	10.3	751	2,916	
Washington.....	4,250	37,000	11.5	288	1,024	340
West Virginia.....	825	31,629	2.6	(15)		
Wisconsin.....	11,500	61,090	18.8	995	2,632	
Wyoming.....	450	10,569	4.3	(16)		
Total.....	247,490	2,273,131	10.9	6,805	35,477	39,988

<sup>1</sup> Also 59 miles of road graded, but not surfaced.

<sup>2</sup> Data approximate.

<sup>3</sup> Also 77 miles of road graded, but not surfaced.

<sup>4</sup> No money aid for construction.

<sup>5</sup> In addition, 2,823 miles of earth road were graded.

<sup>6</sup> Does not include 3,600 miles of grading.

<sup>7</sup> Includes reconstruction, 33 miles.

<sup>8</sup> No State highway department in 1914.

<sup>9</sup> Convict labor aid to counties.

<sup>10</sup> No State highway department.

<sup>11</sup> Supervisory.

<sup>12</sup> Educational and advisory.

<sup>13</sup> State aid begins 1915.

<sup>14</sup> Includes 83 miles of small town construction.

<sup>15</sup> State roads only.

<sup>16</sup> Also 3,700 miles of graded road.

<sup>17</sup> Also 1,104 miles of grading and turnpiking.

<sup>18</sup> Mileage not reported.

<sup>19</sup> State aid in bridge construction only.

<sup>20</sup> Maintenance of State convict road camps.

<sup>21</sup> Also 198 miles of graded road.

<sup>22</sup> In addition, 844 miles of town and county roads.

<sup>23</sup> State and county highways only.

<sup>24</sup> Also 314 miles of earth roads.

<sup>25</sup> Also 104 miles of earth road graded.

<sup>26</sup> Also 602 miles of grading.

#### Comparisons.

Arizona, 240,354 population, is allotted.....	\$117,512
Nevada, 81,875 population, is allotted.....	101,102
Wyoming, 145,965 population, is allotted.....	125,170
New Hampshire, 403,572 population, is allotted.....	175,494
Same with States of larger population—	
Kansas, 1,690,949 population, is allotted.....	\$747,656
Louisiana, 1,656,388 population, is allotted.....	345,064
Massachusetts, 2,366,416 population, is allotted.....	535,420
Missouri, 3,293,335 population, is allotted.....	974,115

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAUNDERS, Mr. BORLAND, and Mr. HELGESEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Dakota rise?

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts said that he would answer questions if he had time, and he now has the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has yielded the floor.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts, my Republican colleague on the Roads Committee, who lives in a great city and, of course, opposes our bill, is careless when he refers to our rural mail routes as "cow trails." If he will go to the real rural sections of the South and call our cherished rural routes "cow trails," his next trip will be up a telephone pole. His speech of an hour makes it clear that no further argument is needed to convince the majority of this House that this road legislation is equitable, beneficial, and desirable at this time.

There is no conflict between the city and the country as the gentleman from Massachusetts has discussed for an hour. Whatever helps the one upbuilds the other. The city and the country are the thoroughbreds of the future, who are to go hand in hand down the ages in patriotic service to our common country. [Applause.] All thinking men know that prosperity to the country brings wealth and success to the city. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in no other way can our Government add so rapidly to the prosperity of the Nation than by contributing to road building, thus saving millions in transportation and making our sparsely settled sections so desirable that the inhabitants will not wish to leave them. If it is wise and beneficial for the State to raise a general fund, as does the State of Louisiana, out of which a portion of the cost of constructing our roads is to be paid, it would seem equally just and equitable for the Federal Government to contribute a portion toward the cost of constructing highways in each and every State. It is a fundamental principle of democratic government that for the common good and in their own interest the strong sections shall contribute their just part in upbuilding the weak. It is a fact that nearly all large appropriations made by the Federal Government in the past have been expended in and near great cities, while but little, and generally nothing, has been expended in our rural sections. The time has come to right this wrong. In the past for their taxes our farmers have received from the Federal Government a few garden seed, a limited number of rural mail routes, and an occasional promise, not yet fulfilled by the Government. This bill, providing that the Federal Government shall pay not less than 30 per cent nor more than 50 per cent of road construction and road maintenance, is the first direct proposition to give the farmers of the country a square deal. [Applause.]

Roads are local concerns, and primarily it is the duty of the States to provide them for their people. On the other hand, it should be noted that no system of permanent highways was ever built or maintained in any country without the substantial aid of the general government of that country.

To carry and deliver the mail is a function of the Federal Government, and it is its duty to provide itself with the facilities necessary to a proper performance of this function, such as postmasters, post offices, and post roads. A post road is just as truly a postal facility as is a post office. As in most rural communities, it has been found less expensive and more expedient to rent post offices than to build them, so it would be less expensive and more expedient to use the roads of the States as post roads than it would to construct and maintain an independent system. In such case it would seem but just that the General Government should make some contribution to the construction and maintenance of the roads which it thus uses.

In times past when the volume and weight of postal matter were negligible the interest of the General Government in the conditions of the roads was not substantial, but with the advent of rural free delivery came a Federal necessity for better roads, and with the now rapidly expanding parcel post that necessity has become acute. The demand upon the Federal Government as expressed by this bill is immediate and imperative, not only for the performance of its functions in the mail service, but to prepare a virile and aggressive citizenship upon which the Government must depend for prosperity and supremacy.

Our great rural population produces the wealth that makes our cities great and perpetuates the power of the Federal Government. They bear the burden of the Government in times of peace, and in times of war the country boy and the boy from the smaller town fearlessly follow the flag where "thickest falls the red rain of human slaughter." He receives little of the blessings of Government beyond the post office and the rural carrier, but in times of need he forgets all this and gives himself freely, if need be, in the cause of his country. [Applause.] This bill is for him. You are for him. The Nation should be for him, for the Government depends upon him. The speedy passage of this bill is but a feeble expression of the gratitude due



him. Then, surely, road building and road maintenance by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States is just, equitable, and beneficial, not only as an economic and social necessity but as one of the highest forms of preparedness that will bring needed wealth to the Government in its hours of possible distress. Germany began her marvelous plan of preparedness by building permanent roads and factories and establishing farm credits and scientific agriculture, thus making her citizens efficient and sufficient as a national asset. [Applause.]

Unless we provide for internal improvements as a basis of our national prosperity, upon what shall the additional taxes be levied to meet the emergency for a proposed larger Army and Navy? A nation impoverished within can not be a world power. In this emergency, I for one shall insist that the increased revenue for the Army and Navy come from a Federal inheritance tax and a larger income tax, so that the usual revenues of the Government may be expended upon our needed internal improvements. [Applause.]

We are to be called upon to expend extra millions for the Army and Navy in preparedness. When is a nation prepared? That nation is best prepared when it equips itself within for stalwart growth, prosperity, and power. Internal stagnation means national weakness. It is understood that preparedness means an adequate Army and Navy, with ample coast defense and an efficient merchant marine, but it also means good roads, good schools, rural mail routes, improved waterways and drainage, scientific agriculture, rural credits, and adequate public buildings for the conduct of the public business. All the people, regardless of class or position, have the same right to enjoy these blessings. My conception of preparedness includes these internal activities to give meaning and force to our national life. As we grow strong within we become more truly the leading world power.

This good-roads bill, directing the Department of Agriculture to expend \$25,000,000 annually in road building and road maintenance, in cooperation with the State highway departments, deals with one of the important factors in national preparedness. The General Government has constitutional power to construct and maintain post roads, military roads, and roads used in the transportation of interstate commerce. On the general principle that the greater contains the lesser, it follows that the General Government should aid the States in the construction and maintenance of such roads.

As a member of the House Committee on Roads, which committee has studied this subject and worked faithfully upon it for three years, I appeal to you, my colleagues, to pass the bill now by such an overwhelming majority that the Senate of the United States, where a similar bill died in the Sixty-third Congress, may respond to the sentiment of the country and pass the bill without delay, so that it may become effective in this year 1916. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] says that the purpose of this bill is to aid the farmers. Well, even if that were the sole purpose of this measure, it would not be an ignoble, or unworthy one. I know of no class of our people who are more deserving of aid than the farmers of the country, or who have received less at the hands of Congress in the way of special legislation. [Applause.] Some gentlemen seem to think that all of our appropriations should be confined to the big cities. In their view it is entirely proper to construct magnificent public buildings in those cities, and expend gigantic sums from the public revenues in dredging deeper the harbors of our port towns. This, in their judgment, is wise legislation and profound statesmanship. But as soon as some Member from a country district seeks to advance rural conditions, and spend a little money for the improvement of the country roads, these same gentlemen oppose such a bill with great vehemence, insisting that it is unconstitutional, and impolitic. A proposition to expend a thousand millions of dollars on a needless increase in our military establishment is hailed with delight, while a bill to expend a meager twenty-five millions on farmers' roads is denounced as a pork barrel. Well the fellows that have been enjoying the fat sides, and plump hams of the past, ought not to begrudge the farmers a few spareribs, and backbones. The Congress has expended many millions upon projects far less meritorious than the great cause of better roads for the farmers. It has expended since 1878, over \$650,000,000 on rivers, and harbors. It has expended over \$400,000,000 on the Panama Canal, and the end is not yet in sight. We donated over 197,000,000 acres of splendid land in the West toward the building of the transcontinental railways.

The farmers have been very patient. "They pay a very large part of the revenues of the Government that go into the Federal Treasury, a larger part in proportion to their wealth than any other class of our citizens. They have received in

return from the Federal Government in the way of appropriations for their benefit, less than any other class. Uncomplainingly, year after year, and decade after decade, they have seen their millions go by the way of Federal appropriations, to the aid of rivers and harbors, for the erection of great and imposing buildings in the cities, for elaborate and expensive coast defenses, for the citizens on the seaboard, and for a thousand other purposes." To crown it all, the men who are advocating a billion-dollar military program, begrudge them this pittance.

Permit me on the part of the committee to reply briefly to one or two of the criticisms that our friend from Massachusetts has directed against this bill. One of them is his objection to our definition of a rural post road. For that definition we rely upon the following provision of the Revised Statutes:

All public roads and highways while kept up, and maintained as such, are hereby declared to be post roads.

If this citation does not furnish ample authority for the definition used in our bill, then I am unable to draw a correct conclusion, or fairly interpret a comparatively simple statute.

One other objection urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts was that in making the apportionment between the States, we took into account the population of the cities. I admit that our scheme of apportionment is purely arbitrary, but I insist that no other scheme than an arbitrary one can be adopted. However, did the gentleman who complains that we have taken into consideration the urban population in the several States, have in mind that the very purpose we had in view in including this population, was to be fair to States like Massachusetts, and New York, with their great cities of Boston, and New York. So with respect to the great urban populations in other States, they too with a view to being fair, were included for the purposes of apportionment. The rest of us would be more than willing to have the gross appropriation divided between the States upon a basis which would eliminate the population of the great cities. Such a scheme of division would be greatly to our advantage. Yet our friend is complaining of a provision that was inserted for his benefit, and for the benefit of other States similarly situated. This illustrates the unreasonable character of his opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House this evening with an argument in favor of good roads designed to present in detail the benefits that will inevitably flow from a universal system of improved highways. I take it for granted that in this age of the world's civilization there is no need to advance such a contention. A universal consensus of judgment in favor of improved highways may be taken for granted. It was an unfair criticism on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts to intimate that the friends of this measure present it as a cure for all the ills of the body politic. We do nothing of the sort. We make no such claim in its behalf. We believe that this measure is a well digested, well worked out, and rational plan to mobilize a portion of the resources of the entire country in aid of domestic development. Further, we expect to satisfy the most exacting critic of this measure that the interests of the Federal Treasury are adequately safeguarded, and that every precaution has been taken to guarantee that the Federal contribution in aid of road construction, will be wisely, economically, and judiciously expended. As guardians of the Federal Treasury we should surround the expenditure of Federal money with appropriate protective provisions. This we have done. The gentleman from Massachusetts belongs to the school of thought that in its day objected to river and harbor development, on the ground that there was no warrant of Federal authority for such work. This objection has long since been abandoned, and if the gentleman was not such a belated representative of an ancient school of strict constructionists, he would know that in this House at least, the time has passed when it is necessary for an advocate of a measure of this character to present arguments for his contention that there is full warrant of constitutional authority for Federal appropriations in aid of the construction, improvement, and maintenance of post roads. [Applause.] The authority to enact this legislation is so fully afforded by the Constitution, that it is no longer open to question, or challenge. But two needful things remain for us to establish on behalf of this measure, and they are, First: Would a universal system of road development in the United States be helpful to the general interests of the entire country? On this proposition, as I have said, we are all agreed. Second: Having in mind the results intended to be secured, is this a bill that will efficiently secure those results? Our bill will be justly criticized, if it is open to the charge that it is so loosely, or carelessly drawn, that the money proposed to be appropriated, may be wastefully, or extravagantly expended. Such however is not the case.



The Members of this body who were here two years ago, and voted for the bill of that session, will recognize that this bill is in large measure along the same lines. It contains the same general principle of Federal aid, but I think I may say to those who voted for the former measure, that the present bill is a better phrased and better balanced bill than its predecessor, and one that will more thoroughly meet the objections of the gentlemen who opposed that bill on the ground that the interests of the General Government were not sufficiently protected. I desire to point out to you that if we have erred in any respect in this measure, it has been along the line of giving too much authority to a Federal department. Still, I do not apprehend that this power will be abused.

We have not included in the present bill that portion of the former bill which divided the roads into classes, and provided a fixed amount to be paid on the roads in each class, contingent on the maintenance by the States of those roads to the standards prescribed. That section was most vehemently assailed in the last session of Congress, and we have eliminated it entirely, without admitting however that these objections were well taken. At any rate we have removed a stumbling block, and rock of offense to a portion at least of our membership.

It was also urged by gentlemen in opposition in the last House, that it was possible for some smaller unit than the State to take up with the Federal department a project of road development, or road maintenance. We have always denied that there was anything in the former bill which in any wise justified this contention, but to meet all objection on this line, we have recast our language in such fashion that this contention is now impossible. It is made absolutely clear that when the Government is approached with respect to a project, either of maintenance, improvement, or construction, it must be approached by the road commission of a State, or its equivalent, as provided by the bill. Since I have been a Member of this body I have seen the full development of popular approval of this principle of Federal aid to roads. Today the great bulk of the States are equipped with road commissions, and these commissions are actively advocating the principle of this bill. Moreover the committee appointed by the National Association of Highway Commissioners, to collaborate and cooperate with your House committee, has given the express stamp of their approval to the pending measure.

I may say further that the Agricultural Department which, on behalf of the Federal Government, will be charged with certain large duties in connection with the execution of this measure, has likewise indorsed the plan of aid reported by your committee, so that this bill comes before you with the favor of the highway commissioners, the favor of the Agricultural Department, and practically the unanimous indorsement of your House committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For how many years has the Roads Committee considered this question upon testimony and by meetings?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is the second bill that the Committee on Roads has reported.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For how many years?

Mr. SAUNDERS. This particular committee was created two years ago. It was established in response to an insistent demand on the part of the country, and of the House, that a committee should be created that could adequately deal with this great subject matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That committee reported this bill unanimously, with the exception of one member.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. I am in sincere sympathy with the purposes of Federal aid to good roads; but I should like to know what there is in the criticism of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that the Federal Government will have no authority or jurisdiction over the roads after the money has been appropriated and expended upon them?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The statement of fact is correct, but the criticism based upon the fact is unfounded. That provision was deliberately inserted in the bill to meet objections that came from all over the country to the effect that if the Federal Government retained jurisdiction over these roads, such retention would introduce perplexing questions of conflicting jurisdiction between the Federal Government, and the States. The com-

mittee was overwhelmingly opposed to Federal jurisdiction over the highways proposed to be aided under the provisions of this bill. It is true, as a matter of fact, that the Federal Government will have no jurisdiction over the roads aided, after the money is once expended in that direction. But this provision should be the subject of commendation, not of criticism.

May I go a step further in the discussion of this bill? We invoke the fullest inquiry into its general purpose, and legislative provisions, and I hope to be able to answer satisfactorily the questions of the friends of this measure who may not be clearly advised as to some of its provisions. At the same time I shall endeavor to repel the criticisms of those who oppose it, either in whole, or in part. But while we believe in the general principle presented, we are not wedded to any particular form of language designed to make that principle effective. As I said, if a project of road development is desired to be submitted by a State, that State approaches the Federal Government through its road commission.

In other words, the unit is the State. The representative of that commission presents the project to the Agricultural Department, giving a sufficient outline of the improvement desired to enable the experts of the Agricultural Department to determine in advance whether the proposition is, or is not, meritorious. Then if the department is inclined to think that the proposition thus presented is meritorious, and worthy of aid out of that proportion of the general fund which is segregated for that particular State, it may call upon the State to furnish further information, and such data, estimates, and plans as will enable the experts of the department to determine the cost of construction, and the full merits of the project, in a word to determine in relation to the case submitted everything that the Federal department ought to know before reaching its conclusions.

Having advanced thus far, if the department approves the project as a whole, the State is authorized to proceed with the work. When the work is concluded, and it is ascertained by the Federal department through its appropriate agents, that the work has been done according to the plans approved by its experts, then the department may make payment of the sum which has been decided upon for this particular project of road construction, improvement, or maintenance. Will any gentleman on this floor suggest that up to this point there is anything of authority lacking to the Federal Government to enable it to safeguard the expenditure of its money, or to compel the construction of the improvements contemplated, upon the terms agreed on between the contracting sovereignties?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a provision in the bill which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to pay money to the States from time to time as the work progresses.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Agriculture could not pay the money until the work was completed and approved.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I should have completed my statement by adding that if, in the progress of the work, it was developed that the same was being done in conformity with the prescribed requirements, the department could make such payments as it chose to make, not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the work already done. But this is a question of discretion in the Government. It is not compellable to make these pro rata payments.

Mr. MADDEN. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a further question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Virginia enlighten the committee on the question of the advisability of clothing the Secretary of Agriculture with the power to say whether 20, 30, 40, or 50 per cent of the cost shall be paid by the Federal Government?

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have fixed those limits—between 30 and 50 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. Whatever it may be.

Mr. SAUNDERS. We have given him that discretion.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask the gentleman what he thinks of the wisdom of that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Personally I would prefer to fix a flat amount of 50 per cent, but the flexible provision was put in to meet the objections that might be urged on the ground that for some work 50 per cent of aid would be too much, and for other work under different conditions, 30 per cent would be too little.

Mr. MADDEN. May I ask one more question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Virginia believe that with that large discretionary power in the hands of the



Secretary of Agriculture, sooner or later political influences will be used upon the Secretary of Agriculture to induce him to pay 50 per cent where only 30 per cent ought to be paid, and 30 per cent where 50 per cent should be paid, and that a political scandal will ensue as the result of that?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not a bit of it. The payments in one State do not concern any State in the Union save the one interested. The amount of money that will go to a State is fixed in advance. The exercise of the Secretary's discretion in aiding the roads of a State, will not increase the aggregate of the allowance for that State, or diminish the respective quotas of the other States.

The Secretary need not make these pro rata payments. They are entirely within the discretion of a Federal official. This provision is another illustration of the painstaking care exercised by the committee to safeguard the Federal interests.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In response to the gentleman from Illinois the gentleman from Virginia stated that under the bill the Secretary of Agriculture could make a partial payment. Is it not true, though, that even that partial payment by the Secretary of Agriculture can not be made unless it shall be shown that in no case it exceeds the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put upon the road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course. And as I said, the Secretary need not make these pro rata payments. These payments are entirely within the discretion of a Federal official. This provision is another illustration of the painstaking care exercised by the committee to safeguard the Federal interests.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I beg the pardon of the gentleman, but I want to make plain, if I can, a point which I think has been misunderstood. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] unintentionally misinterpreted the clause of the bill which was referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. These partial payments, if any, can "in no case be more than the pro rata part of the United States of the value of labor and materials which have been put into such construction or maintenance"—by the State, of course.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, and as I insist again, the Federal Government is not even required to make these partial payments.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I have looked over this bill in rather a rapid way, and I do not find that it would cover an instance of this kind. In California we have carried out these advanced conditions to a remarkable degree. We have raised by a bond issue something like \$18,000,000, and spent it in less than four or five years. We have spent it on a program by which the counties were to contribute almost half that amount; so I should say, without the figures before me, that we have spent \$40,000,000 on improvements of roads within the last four or five years. The question I want to ask the gentleman is, Does your bill cover a case of this kind where, as I say, California and the counties have expended so much money; that is, will the amount provided in this bill be apportioned to California, and can California let it lie to its credit in the Treasury until such time as they can use it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, it must be a working capital, so to say. It must be put to work. But I wish to call the gentleman's attention in this connection, because it is one of the most valuable features of our bill, to the fact that it does not interfere with the domestic road policy of any State. Each State can use its pro rata fund in a way to work out its problem according to its own conception, so as to promote the best interests of road development in that State. Of course the road to be constructed must be one of the approved types prescribed by the bill, and the work must be done under the supervision of the State commission, and the Department of Agriculture.

The gentleman advises us that California has completed a large mileage of roads, something very much to the credit of that State, but these roads must be maintained. A State that fails to provide a maintenance fund, does not meet the situation, and the maintenance fund of your State will be very large. California can utilize her pro rata part of the general fund for the maintenance of the roads which she has already completed.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman's construction of the bill is that it provides for maintenance?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, it says so expressly. Look at the title.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. Has there been any estimate made as to what increase there will be for the number of employees and

overhead charges that would be incurred by the Department of Agriculture in the distribution?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, you can not well make that estimate at this time. No preliminary estimate has been made as yet. The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall retain in his hands a sum sufficient to provide the necessary expert assistants.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. I want to know whether or not the Federal Government will contribute any part of this money to the roads that have been already constructed; will this go to the maintenance of roads over which the Federal Government has had no jurisdiction?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course. The gentleman will see that by looking to the title of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS. The bill proposes to expend not exceeding \$25,000,000 per year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Suppose the State should in a given year not expend quite all of that to which it was entitled under the bill; can it save that up on the treasurer's books?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It remains to the credit of the State until it is returned to the Treasury under the covering-in statute. I think that time is two years.

Mr. ROGERS. Then a State could not roll up for a period of five years the amounts due it, and use it for an elaborate system of highways?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia with whom rests the final determination as to the material that enters into the road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The State submits its plans and propositions to the department at Washington. I said a moment ago that if the bill erred in anything it was in giving too much veto power to the Agricultural Department. The State is entitled under this bill to build any prescribed type of road that it prefers. In one locality it may build a concrete road, in another a macadam road, in another a sand clay road, in still another a dirt road of approved type. The State is compelled to present its proposition to the Federal department. If it satisfies that department that the proposed improvement is meritorious, the work is begun, but if it fails to satisfy the department, that particular project must be dropped.

Mr. KING. The final determination rests with the Federal department at Washington?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, it can put a veto on any proposition that the State submits. I submit that under this bill it will be impossible to expend the money of the Government wastefully and extravagantly, unless the Agricultural Department is corrupt, or inefficient.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under this bill I understand in the process of the work the Government can make partial payment before the whole of the road is completed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, a pro rata part of the value of the work completed up to that time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Whether or not the road is completed through a county or township or a subdivision of the State and completed to the satisfaction of the State highway authorities, full payment could be made for that subdivision.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, pro rata payments in the discretion of the department may be made on any work under construction.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I notice that section 1 of the bill undertakes to define what a rural post road shall be. It says for the purposes of this act the term rural post road shall be held to mean any public road over which rural mail is or might be carried outside of incorporated cities, towns, and boroughs, and so forth. It seems to me that is subject to the construction that it could not be placed upon any rural road or post road that does not extend out of a city of that size.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I think not.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Should not you change that clause so that it would read to public roads outside of incorporated cities of that size?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I will say just this. The committee is not enamored of any particular phrasing. If the

gentleman will prepare his amendment and submit it, and on consideration it appears that the bill is justly amenable to the criticism he makes, there will be no difficulty in having his amendment adopted by the committee.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I understand what the committee intended to express was that rural post roads shall include any road outside of a city of 2,000 inhabitants, and so forth.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I suggest to the gentleman that he prepare his amendment and submit it. There will be no difficulty about accepting any amendment that improves the bill.

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] objected to the bill because, according to his idea, great agricultural States of the West would get a benefit from it over what States in the East would get?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a fact that one of the causes of the high cost of living is the cost of taking the farm products from the farm to the consumer?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is true.

Mr. HELGESEN. Is it not a fact that with good roads the cost of delivering farm products to the market, and to the consumer is reduced from 30 to 75 per cent?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct in his statement.

Mr. HELGESEN. The State of South Dakota, to which he referred as a small unit of less than three-quarters of a million people, undoubtedly hauls 10 times the tonnage that the farmers of the State of Massachusetts do, all of which is food products. If you can reduce the cost of taking those products to the market, it will inure to the benefit of the consumer, of which he is one.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Unquestionably. So far as the criticism of the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, I do not think it is a serious one, and answering it in a sort of ad hominem way, I would say that the agricultural States that are without harbors have heretofore been paying their full part of the money that has gone to those States where there are harbors, and where costly harbor improvements have been constructed, as in Massachusetts for instance.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I notice the gentleman said in answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] that the State could use those funds in any way it saw fit, so far as expenditure on any road is concerned. In other words, if a State had a system of crossroads or interstate highways, it could use its portion of the fund upon that system.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Absolutely, and upon any one road in that system.

Mr. BORLAND. And, on the contrary, if it had simply rural roads or local post roads, it could use the money for the maintenance of that class of roads?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. And that the initiative came from the State?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, and the veto from the Federal Government.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not quite clear in my own mind about this matter. Do I understand that the difference between this money that will be given to these States and the expenditure of Federal funds ordinarily is that after the Government has finally paid the money into this road fund it forever has lost all jurisdiction over the roads through which it goes, while in all other public improvements it maintains some control?

Mr. SAUNDERS. All jurisdiction under this act. If the United States has any jurisdiction otherwise, by virtue of any provision, or section of the Constitution, that jurisdiction is not sought to be interfered with, and could not be interfered with, by this act. But under this act, the Government does not take any jurisdiction as the result of the expenditure of its money under the oversight of the Agricultural Department.

We consider that the Federal Government gets value received for that expenditure in the benefits that will inure to the entire country from this application of a portion of the Federal funds.

Mr. MEEKER. May I ask if this is not the only project of that sort whereby the Government gives its money away and thereafter has no control whatever?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am not prepared to say, but I will admit it, *pro arguendo*. The statement, if true does not detract at all from the merits of the proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the Government contributes money to the departments of agriculture of the various States and retains no control over those departments?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, yes; all of the land grant colleges are aided in that way. That in itself is a sufficient answer to Mr. MEEKER's question. As I said, I am willing to admit that this proposition stands single and alone in the above respect, but that does not impeach its merits.

I wish to make reply to one further objection urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and in this respect I speak from practical experience. I refer in this connection to the inquiry propounded to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN]. The facts that I will cite will show how mere theory must be rejected in the light of actual experience. The gentleman from Texas asked the gentleman from Massachusetts if he did not think that, if this bill went into effect, it would nullify the local spirit of road development, and lay a blight upon the present eager spirit of highway improvement existing throughout the United States. The gentleman from Massachusetts very promptly and enthusiastically agreed that it would. It happens that in the State of Virginia we operate under a system that is precisely analogous to the system that is proposed in this bill; and so far from having paralyzed the zeal of local endeavor, it has been a most helpful aid to road development in our Commonwealth.

Permit me to illustrate the workings of the Virginia system. If a county in that State desires to secure aid from the Commonwealth, it submits its proposition to the State highway commission. That commission sends its engineer to the county concerned. He investigates the project, determines its merit, and reports to Richmond. If the project is approved as meritorious, the highway department causes a survey to be made, and prepares plans. Then it says in substance to the county, "Build this road according to these plans, and when the road is completed we will pay one-half of the cost, out of your quota, as heretofore ascertained." I wish to say that this has been a decidedly helpful policy in aid of the development of good roads in Virginia. With that experience confronting me, I am able to answer, as I have said, from actual knowledge, the question propounded by the gentleman from Texas, and assert with confidence that the pending bill would give a mighty impulse to road development in the entire continental United States.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, if it is not a fact that his own State of Virginia has more miles of unimproved road in proportion to its mileage than any other State in the Union, or had last year?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That may be so. The State of Virginia has not been so fortunately situated with respect to its financial affairs, as the State from which the gentleman comes.

The Civil War left us prostrate in every way, and burdened with a heavy ante-bellum State debt. Crippled, wounded, oppressed with the problems of reconstruction, the Commonwealth of Virginia heroically undertook to pay a large portion of the indebtedness incurred before it was dismembered, and trampled under foot by marching armies. Bowed down under the burden of that indebtedness, which is as yet unpaid, we are open to the ungenerous reproach of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We admit that with better fortune and more ample means, Massachusetts has far exceeded us in the direction of road development. Still, we have not been altogether remiss in this matter, as the following figures will show:

Total amount of bonds issued by the counties for road making between July 1, 1906, and September 30, 1915, \$7,151,100.

Number of miles of macadam and other roads constructed under the supervision of the highway commission during the above period, 3,762.49 miles.

Number of counties in which work was carried on under the supervision of the highway commission during the year ending September 15, 1915, 97 counties.

Total road mileage under construction in the above year by the commission, 846.55 miles.

Cost of same, \$1,893,190.

This work is continually growing.

Mr. SIMS. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. I notice in the bill that the amount is limited to \$25,000,000 per year.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.



Mr. SIMS. That, of course, will not bind any future Congress.  
Mr. SAUNDERS. Of course not.

Mr. SIMS. Further, would it not be rather in the way of development? Would it not practically require the States of the whole Union not to take more than \$25,000,000 a year unless they could participate in the fund?

Mr. SAUNDERS. The scheme of this bill is as equitable a system of distribution as I believe can be worked out. I have already called the attention of the gentlemen who clamorously insist that certain great tax paying States, as they describe them, will contribute an unequal proportion of this money, to the fact that those same great tax paying States will receive by far the greater proportion of the fund to be expended under this bill. The State of New York will get something like a million and a half, out of this \$25,000,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I approve of this bill as a whole; and I want to say, too, what the gentleman said in regard to the working of the law in Virginia is true as to the working of a similar law in Michigan.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am very glad to have the support of the gentleman's experience.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Appropriations have been made by the Legislature of Michigan to pay State awards for the construction of roads, to assist communities in building roads, and to encourage the building of roads by the communities.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question. There was some criticism because the Federal Government is asked to contribute large sums of money and was to have no control whatever over the road after it is built. Would it not be wise or proper to have inserted in this bill a provision to the effect that no road which is built or improved by contribution of Federal money shall ever be made a toll road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, I am not prepared to say at this moment whether that would be a wholesome limitation, but I do not reject the suggestion. Of course I am not in a position to accept it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There are not as many toll roads as there used to be, but in some States I guess there are some now.

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are some in Virginia.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. So as to be sure they would be used always for the general benefit and not for private profit. Some of these roads have tollgates maintained by private interests. Would it not be wise to have a provision that no road which was constructed or maintained, or on which Federal money had been expended, could be made a toll road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. As I say, that is a suggestion that is well worthy of consideration and discussion, but I am not prepared just now, speaking for myself, to say that I accept it. Of course I do not reject it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia has expressed his doubt as to whether the State of New York would be willing to expend a sum equivalent to that allotted to it under this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did not suggest that. I said I doubted whether the contribution in the way of taxes which the State of New York will contribute to the fund of \$25,000,000 would be as much as the amount that it will receive under this bill. It may, or it may not. I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. I want to ask the gentleman if he is aware that the expenditures in the State of New York in the year 1913 for highways was \$13,820,000?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I did not know the figures, but I knew that the State of New York had made great expenditures upon its roads in recent years. New York is a very rich State. I wonder whether this money came from the rural communities where it was expended, or mainly from the great municipalities.

Mr. WALSH. I understood the gentleman to challenge it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, I did not challenge it. You were complaining with respect to the appropriation for this Federal road fund that the big, rich States would pay an unjust and disproportionate amount. I simply said that under this \$25,000,000 apportionment the State of New York would get something like \$1,500,000, and I doubted if the amount she would pay in the way of taxes to make up the fund of \$25,000,000 would amount to \$1,500,000. I do not know whether it would, or not. It is immaterial.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. I favor the general purpose of this legislation, but the gentleman has asked for criticism—

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. We desire to work out a well-guarded bill.

Mr. SLOAN. Suppose the Appropriation Committee, having discretion to appropriate all the way from one cent to millions of dollars, should in view of the condition of the Treasury say that they would appropriate only \$5,000,000 a year, does the gentleman think this would be a fair arrangement among the States to give them, first, the arbitrary factor of \$65,000 and divide the other differentials in accordance with the scope of the bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. If the gentleman can work out a more equitable plan, present it in the way of an amendment.

Mr. SLOAN. Suppose, for instance, they would appropriate \$4,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000, it would all be distributed, would it not, on the first fixed factor?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman think it a wise proposition to leave it in that form?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes. I do not think any State should receive less than \$65,000, because we did not consider that a less sum than that could be economically administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the several States. That was the reason for arbitrarily setting aside \$65,000. An amendment might make it \$25,000 or \$50,000, or whatever was decided upon.

Mr. GORDON rose.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. I wish to inquire whether or not the gentleman from Virginia really believes there is any close analogy, or any analogy at all, between the relations existing between the several States and their several political subdivisions, townships, and counties, and relations between the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Suppose I answer no?

Mr. GORDON. Then I contend your illustration very far fetched, because—

Mr. SAUNDERS. My illustration would not fail at all, because it is not dependent upon the exact character of the relationship. It was given merely to illustrate the manner in which these subdivisions would approach the superior authority. It does not make any difference what the relationship may be. In the relation between the State, and the county, the State has supervision of this project to see that the State money is justly expended in the counties. Under this bill the Department of Agriculture will see that the amount of money that the Government of the United States puts into a project in a State is adequately and properly expended in that State. We need not go into any technical quibbling about the exact character of the relationship under the Federal Constitution between the States, and the Government, as compared with the relation between the States, and the counties.

Mr. GORDON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the different subdivisions of the State the money is spent under State supervision, and the State has absolute control.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Under this bill every dollar will be controlled and expended under the supervision of the Federal Government, so far as the Federal Government contributes a dollar toward any individual project.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that the enactment of this bill will make unnecessary the continuance of the emergency-tax law or war-tax act?

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are some questions I do not think ought to be asked, because they imply a reflection upon the intelligence either of the gentleman who asks them, or of the gentleman of whom they are asked. [Applause.] I do not care to make any other answer to the question.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman does not care to answer that question I would like to ask if he knows the proportion which the State of New York pays of the taxes levied under the emergency-tax law?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No. I am entirely indifferent as to that. If New York pays a large proportion of those taxes, that fact merely shows that her people have prospered more than the rest of the country. That is all. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. And that is the reason you want to enforce this additional burden upon them?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is not a bad reason. If you suggest it as a reason I will accept the suggestion.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the matter of the Federal Government contributing money for the construction of roads in a State and having nothing to do with the use of the money, or the question of what control the Government should have along the line of inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon],

I will say there is precedent for this kind of expenditure, and this proposed character of regulation, under the Lever law, under which money is contributed by the Federal Government for use by the State for farm management and farm demonstration.

The law requires that the agricultural college of the State shall submit a proposition, or rather a plan of operation, for the next succeeding year to the Department of Agriculture, and that plan shall be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Then the money is turned over bodily to the agricultural college, and the agricultural college expends it as it sees fit. It reports to the Secretary of Agriculture the manner in which the money has been expended, and thereafter money can be withheld if the money already received, or before that time received, was not properly expended. It is about on the line of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. With respect to the payment of taxes, the rich man in New York pays in proportion to what he owns, the rich man in Virginia does likewise. If there are more rich men in New York than in Virginia, then they are just that much better off than we are, and we do not begrudge them their good fortune. But if they have more, they ought to pay more, under any equitable system of taxation. The State contributes to build roads in Virginia, but we do not aid a single city with respect to its streets, although the cities of Virginia pay a large proportion of the road tax. I do not know of any system of taxation under which the expenditures in a community are limited to the taxes paid by that community.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts referred to the amount of taxes coming from these different States. Did not the committee itself make a part of the report those very lists so as to invite attention and discussion on the floor?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; and I tried to point out that the argument of my friend from Massachusetts was for that reason not well founded, and that the figures as to urban population that he criticizes, were deliberately put into the report by the committee, so that it would be readily seen that each State would receive a proper proportion of this road fund under the proposed scheme of distribution.

Is there a better scheme of distribution? Certainly the proportion of roads in the States which are used by the Federal Government in the transportation of its mails—and that is becoming an increasing proportion year by year—is a just factor for the purpose of determining the apportionment under this bill. Certainly the number of people in a State that will use the roads to be aided, is a just factor in considering the question of the amount to be expended in that State. Hence we have considered both road mileage, and population, in the solution of the problem. Whatever inequality may be done by one factor of the apportionment, we think is measurably corrected by the other.

If anyone on this floor can work out a juster system of apportionment than that which has been worked out by the committee, I would be glad if he would submit it. I think the system adopted by the committee is entirely fair, and it is precisely the system that the House last year favored by a vote of about 7 to 1 on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Would it not be a good plan to take the number of automobiles owned as a basis?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, if the gentleman wishes, he can put his suggestion in the form of an amendment, and submit it.

Now, one word with reference to my State. While the State of Virginia is not, for the reasons that I have mentioned, as bountifully supplied with good roads as other States more fortunately situated with respect to their financial resources, I wish to say that we are not as badly off as the figures of State construction would indicate. The greater proportion of the roads in Virginia are built by the counties. We have counties in the State of Virginia which have bonded themselves for road purposes in amounts running from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. The roads in those counties are just as good roads as those in the State of my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the gentleman may have the information. There is a road running from Washington down to Virginia. How much has the General Government contributed toward the building of that road?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know. I expect my friend is better apprised as to the facts of that case than I am.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not know what the amount is, but I know that the General Government has contributed some. I do not know just on what excuse it was, but I suspect—

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, that was possibly a road leading to Arlington Cemetery.

Mr. MANN. No; way down into Virginia.

Mr. SAUNDERS. To Mount Vernon, possibly?

Mr. MANN. No; not that.

Mr. SAUNDERS. To the Government experimental farm beyond the Potomac, perhaps.

Mr. MANN. No; they have a road leading to Alexandria and down in that neighborhood.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, anything that would help Alexandria would be justified, I reckon. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MANN. Anything which would help the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] would meet my approval, and I have no doubt that this is what caused them perhaps to call it the "Carlin Road"—for the reason that he had gotten this money out of the Treasury.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What I have said with respect to road construction in Virginia was merely by the way. The counties of Virginia in the last few years, particularly under the impulse of the system of State aid that now prevails there, have expended many million dollars in the betterment of our roads.

Pass this bill and we will spend many millions more. I submit this measure to the House committee, fully believing that we have worked out a measure that will meet the just expectations of every advocate of road development in the United States; a bill which is in aid of the interests of all the people in all the States. I do not stop to measure the benefits that it will confer, or forecast its beneficent influence, for no man can measure the benefits that will accrue to our entire country, from the establishment of such a system of highways as this bill contemplates. I submit this bill to you in the full confidence that it is justly conceived, adequately framed, and destined to accomplish great results of betterment in every State of the Union. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition, and will then yield to the gentleman from Missouri to move that the committee rise.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We will take care of the gentleman from Illinois in the morning. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUCKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

#### ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 610).

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, reports of the Alaskan Engineering Commission, in two volumes, for the period from March 12, 1914, the date of the approval of the Alaskan Railroad act (38 Stat., 305), to December 31, 1915, inclusive, together with accompanying maps, charts, and profiles.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1916.

The SPEAKER. The message is referred to the Committee on the Territories and ordered printed, without the accompanying documents.



## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Kermit, W. Va.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 14, 1916:

H. R. 136. An act granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois.

H. R. 4717. An act to authorize Butler County, Mo., to construct a bridge across Black River.

On January 17, 1916:

S. 2409. An act to authorize the Ohio-West Virginia Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at the city of Steubenville, Jefferson County, Ohio.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1773. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Warfield, Ky., and Kermit, W. Va.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLARK of Florida, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. CONRY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

## LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ANDERSON, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the following cases, no adverse reports having been made thereon:

Thomas O'Reilly (H. R. 7626), Sixty-third Congress;

Louisa M. Salim (H. R. 2185), Sixty-second Congress;

Louisa M. Sabin (H. R. 16351), Sixty-third Congress;

Lucie Bostian (H. R. 2186), Sixty-third Congress;

John Brin (H. R. 4625), Sixty-third Congress;

Melissa J. Gross (H. R. 7311), Sixty-third Congress;

George W. Bryant (H. R. 3423), Sixty-third Congress; and

Benjamin F. Dayton (H. R. 7318), Sixty-third Congress.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request: Mr. Moss of West Virginia asks permission to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies thereof, the papers in connection with the claim of Mrs. Harvey Sayre (H. R. 7136, 63d Cong.), upon which adverse action was taken by the Committee on Claims. (Rept. No. 442, Mar. 23, 1914, by Mr. Mott, from the Committee on Claims.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to this request?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does that come from the Committee on Claims?

The SPEAKER. It is presented by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MANN. It is quite customary to grant leave to withdraw papers where no adverse report has been made, but this is a case where an adverse report has been made. It seems to me some one on the Committee on Claims ought to give attention to the matter before the request is granted. I shall not object at this time, but I think they ought to know about it.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. On the 6th of December House joint resolution 14, laying an embargo on arms, ammunition, and submarines, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A change of reference is asked to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a petition and brief in support of a bill that I introduced to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a petition and brief in support of a bill which he introduced to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman seems to have rather a formidable looking document in his hand. What good will it do to print it in the Record, in fine print, which nobody will read? The committee before which the matter is pending can order it printed if it desires to. It is not customary to print the briefs of lawyers or of other people in the Record. I hope the gentleman will find out what he can get the committee to do before asking to put it in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
Mr. MANN. I object.

## BUREAU OF LABOR SAFETY.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the bureau of safety labor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, it is said that time at last sets all things even, and Goldsmith poetically argues that the blessings of Heaven to all mankind are about distributed equally. So it is with the conduct of the able gentleman who refers the bills in this House to the different committees. He manages to give to the committee of which I am chairman about as many bills to which the committee is not entitled as it takes away from its proper jurisdiction and gives to other committees. In point is the one just transferred from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is another bill, which I introduced myself, proposing an amendment to a law enacted on the report of the Committee on Military Affairs in the last session of Congress. The bill ought to go to that committee instead of to my committee. I have not the bill in my hand, but I will get the bill and the number and give it to the proper clerk, and I ask unanimous consent that the reference be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman must have the number of the bill and not take any chances.

Mr. ADAMSON. It is the only bill that I introduced to correct the Panama bill at the last session.

Mr. MANN. I know what the bill is; I have read the bill. I objected to granting the request because it is such a loose way of doing business. The clerks could never keep track of them.

Mr. ADAMSON. It can not be very loose, because I will get the bill and give the number to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 20, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$7,500 for an increase in the salaries of the three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury Department, from \$5,000 to \$7,500 each per annum (H. Doc. No. 595); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an amendment to estimate for salaries, office of the Supervising Architect, as printed on page 38 of the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 596); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an amended estimate of appropriation under "Salaries, office of Quartermaster General," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 597); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication of the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$386 for the relief of John E. Jones, an American consul of class 3 (H. Doc. 598); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Knapp Narrows, Md., with a view to securing a deeper channel between Tilghman Island and the mainland (H. Doc. No. 599); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Delaware River, N. Y., N. J., and Pa., at or near the mouth of

the Neversink River (H. Doc. 600); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on Morris Cove, New Haven Harbor, Conn., with a view to the construction of a harbor of refuge (H. Doc. 601); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Piscataway Creek, Prince Georges County, Md., and entrance thereto (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Saugatuck Harbor and Kalamazoo River, Mich., with a view to securing increased depth to the town of Douglas (H. Doc. No. 608); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Columbia River at Kennewick, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 603); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting reports of bureau officers concerning typewriters, adding machines, and similar labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year 1915, transmitting a further communication from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, explaining that there were no exchanges of this character in the Manila (P. I.) district during said year (H. Doc. No. 604); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Judge Advocate General of the Army, together with a list of leases granted by the Secretary of War during the calendar year 1915 (H. Doc. No. 605); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates in connection with the legislative, executive, and judicial bill (H. Doc. No. 606); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Comptroller of the Currency, amending his estimate of appropriation on page 43 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1917, for "Salaries, office of Comptroller of the Currency" (H. Doc. No. 607); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Public Printer, submitting urgent estimates of deficiencies in appropriations for the Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 609); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII:

Mr. KEY of Ohio, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 54) to pension widows and minor children of officers and enlisted men who served in the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or in China, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 59), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2202) granting an increase of pension to Martha Ann Benjamin; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3844) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Kerlee; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6330) granting a pension to Joseph F. Flynn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7103) granting an increase of pension to Willard L. Anthony; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Edward A. Ward; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7472) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bruce; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7475) granting an increase of pension to H. R. Watkins; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8851) granting a pension to John Zanger; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9409) to repeal sections 35 to 49, inclusive, of the act of June 13, 1898, concerning mixed flour, as amended by the act of March 2, 1901, and as further amended by the act of April 12, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9410) for the erection of a public building at Galva, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9411) to require numbering and recording of undocumented vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9412) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of May 16, 1906; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9413) for the erection of a public building at Rushville, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9414) to grant certain holidays to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9415) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows and remarried widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 9417) to fix the price for gas in the District of Columbia and prescribing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 9418) authorizing the construction of two wagon bridges across the Umatilla River, in the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 9419) to appropriate money to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to license and inspect warehouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 9420) to transfer the Bureau of Mines to the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BRITT: A bill (H. R. 9421) to extend the free-mail privilege to official mail matter of the Organized Militia and Naval Militia of the several States and Territories of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9422) to provide for the construction of a public building at Rock Hill, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9423) for the erection of a public building at Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9424) for the erection of a public building at York, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9425) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the Battle of Cowpens on the 17th day of January, 1781; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9426) for the erection of a public building at Winstonsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9427) for the relief of a certain class of officers on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 9428) relating to procedure in United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9429) to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United



States, shall, in certain cases, aid the States in the construction and maintenance of rural post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 9430) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9431) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9432) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HELGESEN: A bill (H. R. 9433) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9434) to give a legal status to a dam constructed in the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9435) to prevent the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9436) to amend the provisions of section 12, act of February 8, 1875, as amended by section 2, act of March 1, 1879, and section 3149 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 2, act of March 1, 1879, as to the appointment and bonding of deputy collectors of internal revenue; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 9437) granting pensions to Emergency Men of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREAR: Resolution (H. Res. 98) instructing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate railroad opposition to river and harbor legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 99) authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions of transportation to Mount Vernon, Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the election of Representatives for a four-year instead of a two-year term; to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FINLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) providing for the printing of the roster of the officers and enlisted men of the Union and Confederate Armies; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) providing for a committee to investigate certain matters relating to the matériel of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 9438) granting an increase of pension to John Flight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 9439) granting a pension to Richard Devers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 9440) granting a pension to Leo F. Raske; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9441) granting a pension to Dorcas A. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9442) granting an increase of pension to George E. Roe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9443) granting an increase of pension to John W. Pence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 9444) for the relief of Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9445) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 9446) for the relief of George Welty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9447) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9448) granting a pension to Claudia E. Geary; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9449) for the relief of Axel Jacobson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9450) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9451) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9452) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Clevenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 9453) granting a pension to Herman W. Brouel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9454) for the relief of the Cheraw Lyceum, Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9455) for the relief of the heirs of James H. Gardner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9456) granting an increase of pension to Paul Beyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9457) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Gerber; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 9458) for the relief of the heirs of Santos Benavides; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9459) for the relief of the heirs of S. P. H. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9460) for the relief of the heirs of Joshua D. Haskett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 9461) vesting jurisdiction in the Court of Claims to entertain the claim of Charles A. Morrison, as administrator de bonis non of the estate of William Morrison, deceased, against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9462) granting a pension to Ellen S. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 9463) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Norwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9464) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Wood and the estate of I. T. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9465) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9466) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Charles Johnson and Kate Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9467) granting a pension to Rufus R. Ford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 9468) for the relief of the heir of Wiley Yarborough; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9469) for the relief of the widow of John Norwood; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9470) for the relief of the heirs of Henderson C. Rush, Ben Wheeler, and James M. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9471) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9472) for the relief of the heir of Hundley V. Fowler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 9473) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Dickinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9474) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Calhoun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9475) granting a pension to Thomas D. Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 9476) to authorize the President to award a medal of honor to Dr. John T. Nagle, for conspicuous bravery at the Battle of Kernstown, Virginia, on July 24, 1864, while serving as an acting assistant surgeon of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 9477) granting a pension to Violetta Wyckoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9478) for the relief of John Burke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9479) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of R. W. Harris, administrator of James P. Harris, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 9480) granting an increase of pension to Millard I. Nettleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9481) granting an honorable discharge to Larkin T. Robinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9482) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Assmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9483) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9484) granting an increase of pension to Jeannie Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9485) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9486) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Feldkamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9487) to remove the charge of desertion against James McGinnis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 9488) granting an increase of pension to Robert Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9489) granting an increase of pension to Henry Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9490) granting an increase of pension to Erastus P. Daggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9491) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 9492) granting a pension to Poppy H. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 9493) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 9494) granting a pension to Katie Noblitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: A bill (H. R. 9495) granting an increase of pension to Abby J. Cadwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 9496) granting a pension to William D. Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 9497) granting a pension to William B. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9498) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9499) granting a pension to Sarah E. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 9500) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to readjudicate the cases of Mattie W. Jackson, widow, and others against The United States and Mattie E. Hughes against The United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 9501) to correct the military record of James M. Wiley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 9502) granting an increase of pension to Warren E. McIntyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 9503) granting an increase of pension to James D. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9504) granting a pension to William Couture, or Goodhue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 9505) granting a pension to Isaac Hammett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9506) granting an increase of pension to W. B. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9507) granting an increase of pension to John T. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9508) granting a pension to Sue M. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 9509) granting a pension to Rebecca A. Beery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 9510) granting a pension to Cale Trippett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 9511) granting a pension to Victoria Pemberton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9512) granting a pension to Cassie Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9513) granting an increase of pension to Conrad L. Westerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9514) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Charles P. Phillips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 9515) for the relief of John J. Mangen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 9516) granting a pension to Joseph W. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 9517) for the relief of John A. O'Keefe, administrator of estate of William M. O'Keefe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 9518) for the relief of Henry Fuller, administrator of Philo Fuller, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9519) granting an increase of pension to Dallas F. Jarvis; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Waterville (Me.) Defense Society, favoring adoption of the Swiss military plan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of West Lafayette Bank and the Farmers' and Merchants' Bank, of Warsaw, Ohio, protesting against stamp on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALES: Memorial of Philadelphia (Pa.) Bourse requesting the unconditional repeal of the seamen's act and enactment of a comprehensive law that will develop an American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh relative to railway-mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of laborers employed in Pittsburgh (Pa.) post office favoring the classification of laborers in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BENNET: Petition of Swedish Americans, Friends of Peace, an organization having over 50,000 members, favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Salem (N. J.) Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of W. H. Wade and 50 others, of Plymouth and Sheboygan Counties, Wis., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 83 members of the Sheboygan (Wis.) Liquor Dealers' Protective Association, protesting against increase in the tax on beer, wines, liquor, cigars, tobacco, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Wisconsin Retail Clothiers' Association at Madison, Wis., favoring passage of House bill 4715 to prevent discrimination in prices and to provide for publicity of prices to dealers and to the public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of West Bend (Wis.) Woolen Mills, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Illinois, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of A. V. Morris & Sons and Van Brocklin & Stover, of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring protection to the American manufacturers of dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of board of supervisors of Napa and other California counties, favoring legislation for the preservation of the California oil industry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Brooklyn Teachers' Association, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of C. K. Gleason, of New York, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Harry D. Wescott, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of the Church Peace Union, of New York, protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers to accompany House bill 9267, granting an increase of pension to William F. Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of L. S. Olson and 28 others, of Hixton, and J. B. Scheil and 41 others, of Unity, Wis., urging passage of the



Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9268, granting a pension to Mahala Claflin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Wisconsin Retail Clothiers' Association, of Beloit, Wis., favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of the Franklin Board & Paper Co., of Franklin, Ohio, favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Brooklyn Teachers' Association, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago Insulated Wire & Manufacturing Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Earl Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Earlville, Ill., protesting against the tax on mutual insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Motor Club, protesting against a proposed tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of S. D. Warren & Co., of Boston, Mass., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of L. L. Vincent and others, of Rickreall, Oreg., favoring law abolishing manufacture of intoxicating liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Monthly Meeting of Society of Friends at Flushing, Ohio, and representative committee of the Yearly Meeting of Society of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., and Joseph E. Myers and other citizens, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULBERT: Memorial of Iron Shipbuilders' Co-operative Association and Drillers and Tappers' League, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to more pay for workmen in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany House bill 7120, granting a pension to Robert A. Imrie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Boulder (Colo.) Commercial Association, urging the passage of House bill 651 as a measure both fair and equitable to shipper and carrier; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Petitions of Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., of Chicago, Ill.; Gardiner Hall, Jr., & Co., of South Wilmington, Mass.; and the American Mills Co., of Waterbury, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of sundry citizens of Ahmeek, Mich., favoring exacting full reparation from the Mexican Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the executive board of the Rhode Island Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of James I. Jenks, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill 8234, the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Sydney Worsted Co., of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Memorial of Retail Clothiers' Association, protesting against passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of 147 citizens of Roulette, Pa., protesting against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Union League Club of New York, relative to national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Association of Ex-Deputy Collectors of Internal Revenue, protesting against taking position of internal-revenue collector from under civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the American Institute of Architects, protesting against bill for building for Department of Justice; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of more than 3,000 citizens of St. Louis City and County, Mo., favoring passage of a bill for improvement of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Paul Bertrand, Charles G. Mayer, and John Lieb and others, of Philadelphia,

favoring bill to prohibit sale of ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also (by request), petition of Lawrence Litchfield, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Petition of sundry business men of Gilbert, Minn., urging passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of Brownsville Paper Co., of Brownsville; Knowlton Bros., of Watertown; G. C. Chauncey and others, of Phoenix and Fulton; and Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 702, for dyestuff tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON: Petitions of merchants in the third congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring passage of bill taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of the third congressional district of Wisconsin, favoring illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of Peter Graff & Co., of Worthington, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKEY (by request): Memorial of New Britain Retail Wine, Liquor, and Beer Dealers' Association, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of German-American Alliance, of Tiffin, Ohio, favoring an embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Santa Clara Camp, No. 111, and Erambert-Case Camp, No. 77, Department of Ohio, Spanish War Veterans, favoring pensions for widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Sandusky Council, Knights of Columbus, No. 546, favoring the passage of House bill 4699, to make the 12th day of October each year a legal holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of C. F. Hoag & Co., of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the Merrill Silk Co. and the Merrill Hosiery Co., both of Hornell, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 702, entitled "A bill to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the manufacture of dyestuffs"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of California State Board of Education, favoring Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Lassen County, Cal., protesting against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring bill for Federal censorship of motion picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring passage of the Stevens standard-price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNELL: Petitions of John F. Butler, R. J. Sanford, J. R. Weston, T. H. Perrin & Co., C. E. Haywood, H. W. Pearl, Henry Wells Co., W. F. Hinman, Smith & Smith, Scott Mayfield, W. H. Bartholomew, C. W. Kennedy, John A. Dutches, M. Needham, Thomas Woods, E. J. Denney, H. J. Van Ness, F. T. Swan, L. Goldsmith, Whitney & Sackett, Floyd & Morgan, Sullivan & Fobes, Elliott Taylor & Sons, Willis McGee & Co., O. P. Benson, James H. Sullivan, and F. A. Weed, all of Potsdam, N. Y., urging the passage of the Stevens maintenance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Mohawk Valley Paper Co., of Little Falls; Mohawk Valley Cap Factory and Foster Box Board Co., of Utica, N. Y., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Ashaway (R. I.) Line & Twine Manufacturing Co., favoring passage of House bill 702, for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of J. W. Busiel & Co., of Laconia, N. H., favoring passage of House bill 702, for tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petitions from the citizens of Hotchkiss, Paonia, Cortez, Delta, Durango, Ouray, Telluride, Montrose, Grand Junction, Leadville, Glenwood Springs, Silverton, Gunnison, Mancos, Dolores, Palisade, Kremmling, Hot Sulphur Springs, Steamboat Springs, Yampa, Oak Creek, Hay-

den, Craig, Aspen, Breckenridge, Basalt, New Castle, Silt, Eagle, Redcliff, Minturn, Fruita, Carbondale, Grand Valley, Clifton, De Beque, Rifle, and Olathe, in the fourth congressional district of Colorado, in support of the measure to tax interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Forsythe Dyeing Co., of New Haven, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph A. Parker & Sons Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Coral Manufacturing Co., of Norristown, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 20, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy favor and grace and guidance for the duties of this new day. Our duties are ever increasing; our responsibilities are more and more with every coming day. By Thy grace we have erected a great empire and by Thy grace alone shall we be enabled to project the policies which carry out the plans and secure the permanency of our Nation's life, and the development of all its resources. Grant us Thy guidance and blessing as Thou hast given Thy guidance and blessing to the fathers. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### REFUNDS OF DRAWBACKS (S. DOC. NO. 248).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 18, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the Senate resolution, dated the 10th instant, directing me to submit to the Senate a statement showing certain data relative to applications for, and payment of, drawbacks under paragraph O, Section IV, of the present tariff act, for various periods.

In reply I have to state that instructions have been given to various collectors of customs to forward the required data to the department, where it will be compiled and submitted to the Senate with the least possible delay. I may add that the clerical labor involved, requiring as it does reference to every drawback transaction in the Customs Service for a period of two and a half years, will consume considerable time, but that the same will be expedited in every possible way.

Respectfully,

W. G. McAdoo, Secretary.

### WATER-POWER SITES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, January 17, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: In accordance with the provisions of Senate resolution No. 544, passed by the Sixty-third Congress, third session, I have the honor to transmit herewith the information in my possession as to the ownership and control of the water-power sites in the United States; showing what proportion of such water-power sites is in private ownership and by what companies and corporations such sites in private ownership are owned and controlled; what horsepower has been developed and what proportion of it is owned and controlled by such private companies and corporations; and facts bearing upon the question as to the existence of a monopoly in the ownership and control of hydroelectric power in the United States.

Respectfully,

D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know what to do with the accompanying papers.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the matter be printed as a public document. It contains valuable information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Here it is [indicating].

Mr. MYERS. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, then.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me that as the question is being dealt with by the Committee on Commerce it ought to go to that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question of constitutionality is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and also by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. The subject matter, however, is before the Committee on Public Lands. I think the communication and accom-

panying papers ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, they will go to the Committee on Printing.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 153. An act to create a Bureau of Labor Safety in the Department of Labor;

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the Public Utilities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a letter in the nature of a petition from Hon. A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of Montana, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD with his signature.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA, SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Helena, January 14, 1916.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In 1907 reconnaissance and preliminary surveys were begun upon the Flathead irrigation project in northwestern Montana.

In 1908 a construction upon the project was authorized and the first appropriation made by act of Congress. In 1909 actual construction was begun.

In spite of the fact that since the beginning of actual work in 1909 more than six years have elapsed, the project is now only 22.2 per cent completed.

The Flathead project is the largest and most comprehensive Indian irrigation scheme ever undertaken in the United States. The area of the completed project is about 152,000 acres. There is not the slightest question but what all of these lands would easily pay the water-construction charge of \$45 an acre, or even more, if necessary.

There has been a large amount of settling upon these lands, but the people have found, to their sorrow, that they are unable to make a living without irrigation. They have been led to believe, and were entitled to believe, that the Government of the United States would complete this project.

It never can be completed within the lifetime of a settler now upon the project with such insignificant appropriations as have been made in recent years. A large amount of the work already accomplished will go to pieces and its value will be lost unless the work is pushed to final accomplishment.

The State of Montana is firmly of the opinion that an appropriation of \$1,000,000 should be made for the Flathead project this year of 1916, and we ardently hope that the Congress of the United States will recognize the necessity for such an appropriation.

I have the honor to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

A. M. ALDERSON,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present the petition of pupils of the Reservoir Valley School, in Montana, praying for an appropriation for the Flathead reclamation project in that State. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD with the name of the first signer and underneath the words "and many others" and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### RESERVOIR VALLEY SCHOOLHOUSE.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undersigned, pupils of the Reservoir Valley Schoolhouse, do most urgently and respectfully petition of Congress that an appropriation of not less than \$1,000,000 be passed by this session of Congress for work on the Flathead irrigation project for the ensuing year. This schoolhouse is located within the Flathead project and our education will depend to a large extent on the manner that this project is prosecuted.

Respectfully,

VENUS CAFFEY,  
(And many others).

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions in the nature of a petition, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.